

SENATE—Friday, May 21, 1993

(Legislative day of Monday, April 19, 1993)

The Senate met at 10 a.m., on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the Honorable CHARLES S. ROBB, a Senator from the State of Virginia.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Richard C. Halverson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Let us pray:

In a moment of silence, let us remember Noel Coffey, one of our floor men, who is undergoing a third bypass today.

**** they that wait upon the Lord shall renew their strength; they shall mount up with wings as eagles; they shall run, and not be weary; and they shall walk, and not faint.—Isaiah 40:31.*

Gracious God our Heavenly Father, we join in prayer for Senator HEFLIN, that he may be restored rapidly to health and strength. We thank Thee for the speedy recovery of Mrs. Rockefeller and pray that You will give her patience until her recovery is complete.

Father in Heaven, in a large Senate family like ours, many can be hurting, and most of us know nothing about it. We join in prayer for those among us who suffer. Where there is sickness, grant recovery. Where there is loneliness, remind them of Your nearness. Where there is tragedy, fill hearts with Your peace. Where there is alienation in the family, bring healing and reconciliation. Where there is financial difficulty, remind them You have promised to supply all their needs.

Loving Lord, touch every life in our family where there is need, and help us all remember that You are a God of infinite, unconditional love, and that You really care.

We pray in the name of the Great Physician. Amen.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore [Mr. BYRD].

The assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, May 21, 1993.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, section 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable CHARLES S. ROBB, a Senator from the State of Virginia, to perform the duties of the Chair.

ROBERT C. BYRD,
President pro tempore.

Mr. ROBB thereupon assumed the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, there will now be a period for the transaction of morning business for not to extend beyond the hour of 10:20 a.m.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GRASSLEY] is recognized for up to 10 minutes.

THE PRESIDENT'S TAX PLAN

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, how many times have we asked what time it is, and the response came back in Greenwich mean time? Probably not very often. Because it is an inappropriate response. If I ask what time it is, what good would it do me if someone responds: "It's 3 o'clock Greenwich mean time?"

Earlier this year, Mr. President, members of the Finance Committee on which I serve, asked the Treasury Department, in effect, what time it is. This week, we received their response. It was equally inappropriate.

They responded with the equivalent or Greenwich mean time. They provided a dissertation on why Greenwich mean time is a preferred standard for telling time than is eastern daylight time. What good does that do, Mr. President?

Now, why would I be standing here in Washington, DC, wanting to know Greenwich mean time?

Let me put the issue more in context. In February, several of us on the Finance Committee, led by Senator ROTH and Senator PACKWOOD, asked Secretary Lloyd Bentsen for clarification of the President's tax plan. Clarification was essential. The tax tables supplied by the Treasury were based on what is known as family economic income.

FEI is a system well-known to economists and policymakers. In fact, they are the only ones who understand it. The average taxpayer does not.

Let me take a stab at explaining what FEI is. It is an attempt to measure a family's economic well-being. It includes noncash income which is not included in adjusted gross income, or AGI.

FEI includes such things as the imputed rental value of the family home; life insurance; the Social Security checks of a live-in parent; tax-exempt interest; most Government transfer payments; IRA's; deductible retirement contributions; and health insurance, to name a few.

What FEI really is, however, is a distortion of what a taxpayer's actual income is. The taxpayers cannot understand it.

That is, they cannot understand family economic income. They do understand adjusted gross income.

I challenge the Treasury to try and convince average, overtaxed Americans—you know, the ones who can't afford a \$200 haircut by a glitzy, Hollywood hairdresser—that his or her health benefits and deferred retirement are actually income.

Taxpayers understand another distribution system, based on adjusted gross income. That is because they have to determine what their AGI is on their yearly tax forms.

So the clarification is needed in a language familiar to the taxpayers. They need a simple, bottom-line explanation of who owes what under the President's tax plan.

After all, the President said no one making less than \$30,000 a year will be taxed under his plan.

I think we all know that that is baloney. A skeptical public—already gravely afflicted with promise shock in this young administration—wants to see for itself. Seeing is believing, when it comes to taxes, and when it comes to this administration.

So the committee's request was for a response in terms of adjusted gross income. Instead, the response was a discourse on why family economic income is a more appropriate system for the taxpayers. But what good does this answer do for the taxpayers?

They still do not know where they stand.

And so today, I have made a new request—to the President. I made a request for this data on how his program and tax increases square when on a level playing field with adjusted gross income.

Mr. President, no one disputes the worth of distribution tables based on family economic income. Family economic income has been around for a long time. But so has adjusted gross income. And both sets of tables have been provided to the public by previous administrations.

Until now.

Why do you suppose that is, Mr. President?

And on what basis is the information denied? The only rational explanation given was in a letter of response to Senator PACKWOOD from Secretary Bentsen, dated May 18.

Let me quote from that letter. Secretary Bentsen writes:

The Treasury Department continues to believe that a distribution table using AGI as the income measure would confuse, rather than clarify, assessment of the administration's revenue proposals.

Mr. President, let me repeat that quote.

This is from Secretary Bentsen's letter back to us in the Congress.

The Treasury Department continues to believe that a distribution table using adjusted gross income as the income measure would confuse, rather than clarify, assessment of the administration's revenue proposals.

Now, Mr. President, I do believe that statement borders on the cynical. The President stated that no one under \$30,000 would be taxed under his proposal. Taxpayers have a right to verify that statement. Taxpayers understand adjusted gross income. They do not understand family economic income. Tables based on AGI have always been made available to the public. For some reason, this administration is covering it up. Without that data, taxpayers cannot verify the President's word.

Did the President misspeak? Is this another breach of the public trust? Give us the data, President Clinton.

This was supposed to be an administration that would outlaw smoke and mirrors. What is this, if not smoke and mirrors?

Mr. President, this is not a partisan issue. The chairman of the Finance Committee has also supported the release of this information.

Senator PAT MOYNIHAN of New York, the chairman of the Senate Finance Committee has requested the very same information from the administration that Senator PACKWOOD and Senator ROTH has asked for.

Rather, this is clearly a bipartisan issue. It is the case of the people versus the Clinton administration. The adjusted gross income data is exhibit A, and it is missing. We need to lay exhibit A out on the table. The administration's failure to provide this data is a failure to level with the American people. It is a further violation of the public trust, and it further erodes the credibility of this administration.

Judging from their reluctance to provide this data, it must be incriminating.

It apparently would show that the President's tax bill is really much broader and more extensive than what the taxpayers have been led to believe and what the President has admitted. It apparently hits those making substantially less than \$30,000 a year.

No President can hold the trust of the Nation by deceiving them. Now

that the administration has been challenged, they should come clean. Stonewalling only draws more attention to what they are hiding.

President Clinton, give us the data. I yield the floor.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Republican leader is recognized.

Mr. DOLE. We are in morning business; is that correct?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct. The period for morning business has not yet formally terminated. Under the previous order, the period for morning business is to be concluded by 10:20 a.m.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, is the leader time reserved?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct.

THE BTU TAX AND JOBS

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, yesterday morning's papers carried accounts of our Nation's trade deficit being the worst in 4 years. However, the spotlight of blame is being directed at the wrong villain. For those of you who missed it, Wednesday's papers told us that, during the past 4 months, domestic oil production was at a 32-year low, and imported oil had to take its place. Unfortunately, the immediate future doesn't hold much hope for turning this bad news around—the number of drilling rigs operating in the first 3 months of this year was an all time low. Now, to guarantee there will be no long-term solution, President Clinton continues to insist that we impose an additional tax on this already crippled industry and on our crippled trade deficit.

The news stories on the trade figures point to the fact that we have the largest deficit with Japan. What most fail to explain is the real story: Last year, imported oil represented over one-half of the entire U.S. merchandise trade deficit. Oil imports for the first 3 months were 6.2 percent higher than the year before and the highest since August of 1991. As I have said before, our biggest trade problem really is not Toyotas or Sonys—it is oil.

So, 53.2 percent of our trade deficit in 1992 was crude oil and petroleum product. In response, rather than opening new areas for exploration, we closed them. Rather than streamlining regulations, we have increased them. As a result, for the first 4 months of this

year, domestic production fell below 7 million barrels per day—the lowest level since 1960. It does not take any knowledge of the oil industry to figure out if domestic production is dropping and imports are rising, we've got a problem.

The key measure of the health of the domestic oil industry is the active drilling rig count—the amount of actual exploration being conducted. The first 3 months of 1993 saw the average number of drilling rigs looking for oil and natural gas in the United States dwindle to 74—an all-time low. For comparison, this is down from 78 in 1992 and 114 in 1991. Throughout the 1970's and early 1980's, the number averaged 408. Domestic production cannot increase without an increase in the rig count. Yet, it too is on a decline with no indication of reversal.

According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, the oil and gas industry has lost 477,000 jobs over the past 10 years—52 percent of this industry's entire work force. What needs to be done to make America competitive, to reduce our foreign trade deficit, to increase employment, and to stimulate this economy is to find some way to help the oil industry.

But, the proposal we have from the administration is to impose a crushing tax on this very industry. I am not aware of any example of the Government stimulating an industry by taxing it. Yet that is what we are being asked to do under the Btu tax.

In the oil and gas business, the cost of fuel and chemicals used to produce the crude and gas is usually between 10 and 20 percent of the total costs of production. Yet, those are not fully exempt. We will make our oil even more expensive, driving oil imports and the trade deficit higher and the number of domestic jobs lower.

Realistic estimates of total job losses due to a Btu tax range between 400,000 and 600,000. We simply cannot allow such a wrong-headed policy to be enacted at a time we are promising to increase employment.

I urge President Clinton to review the facts and reconsider his request for the Btu tax. We cannot afford it at a time that the oil industry and the trade deficit are in such perilous shape.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. FORD].

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, I want to compliment the Republican leader for admitting that 52 percent of the oil industry was lost in the last decade. It just is not something that occurred in the last 4 months. So I welcome his remarks. It appears that, again, they are trying to make everyone think it just occurred in the last few months.

OLDER AMERICANS MONTH

Mr. COHEN. Mr. President, I am pleased once again to take this time to commemorate Older Americans Month.

We set aside this time to recognize the contributions made by millions of senior citizens to our great Nation. Without their willingness to sacrifice, their embrace of hard work, their endurance of poverty and hard times, and their moral strength, America would be a very different place indeed.

The celebration of Older Americans Month is one small but meaningful way of acknowledging the fundamental role seniors have played in the perpetuation and preservation of our democracy. It is a time to express a debt of gratitude to them as well as a time to assess our progress on enriching their lives.

At present, senior citizens over the age of 65 comprise about 12 percent of the population. While their annual income is slightly less than that of their younger counterparts, age 18 to 65, the rate of poverty for seniors has been reduced more than half since 1966. Life expectancy rates for seniors have increased significantly in this century. Retirement is a greater option for many more seniors than in the past, and it lasts longer as well.

These statistics paint a relatively sunny portrait of our senior population, and reflect the success of programs like Social Security, Medicare, the Older Americans Act and others that have helped to improve the lives of our older population.

As we move into the 21st century, however, we must take heed of the coming changes in the statistical portrait of the elderly population if we are to avoid serious challenges to their health and well-being. In addition, we must continue to pay close attention to the needs of today's senior population so that we can tackle the problems that face in living their golden years.

What do these statistics show? In 1989, almost a third of those over the age of 65 lived alone. Among people over the age of 85, however, far more, in fact almost half, lived alone. The number of women in these age categories is daunting indeed; a full 82 percent are widowed. They face special problems. Because they worked in low-paying jobs or did not work at all, their Social Security checks are not generous. As a result, the rate of poverty for those over 85 living alone is far higher than for other segments of the population. They are more vulnerable to criminal and fraudulent activities, they are more isolated, and they often escape the reach of even the most active aging network. We must do more to make the quality of life better for this segment of our elder populations.

Let's also look more closely at statistics on the health of today's older Americans. While these seniors are living longer, they remain disproportionately dependent on health services in comparison to other segments of the population. They visit a physician eight times a year, compared with five

visits by the general population. They are hospitalized over three times as often as the younger population, stay 50 percent longer, and use twice as many prescription drugs.

These figures demonstrate that as our overall health care costs continue to rise, the elderly will continue to shoulder a greater financial burden. At the same time, they are far more likely to be on a fixed income.

Finally, the projected growth of the aging population, while still several years away, raise important questions about our ability to serve them adequately. By the year 2030, the size of the population over 65 is expected to double to where it constitutes one-quarter of our Nation's population. During this time, the size of the population over the age of 85 is expected to triple.

If current trends in the lifestyle of our elders continue, we will be facing formidable challenges in caring for the frail elderly who don't require institutionalization, in making health care affordable for those on fixed incomes, and in ensuring that seniors continue to be involved in community life.

Both today's senior citizens and the aging baby-boomers face serious problems that directly affect their well-being and that of our Nation as a whole. These include the potential insolvency of the Federal fund that guarantees private pensions, the health of the Social Security trust fund, ever-increasing costs of prescription drugs, the availability of affordable long-term care, and the potential elimination of retiree health benefits.

As I have traveled my State of Maine and listened to its senior citizens, it is evident that these concerns are very real. Maine's statistical portrait is generally similar to the national one. The proportion of elderly residents in Maine is slightly greater than the national average, and in the next 30 years, the number of individuals over the age of 65 is expected to more than double in size.

As in the Nation as a whole, today's problems are pressing indeed in my State. The number of seniors living poverty in Maine exceeds the national average by 3 percentage points. In some counties in Maine, over half of those residents living alone are over the age of 65. The rural nature of the State poses special challenges to those working to reach poor, isolated seniors and improve their quality of life. The task is an enormous one, but we must remain committed to it.

Unfortunately, senior citizens, who have contributed so much to this country over the years, are beginning to hear the cries and whispers of others who believe that they have received more than their fair share; that they are living well at the expense of the younger generation, and that they ought not to ask for any more from the rest of us.

Mr. President, in this Nation today we are on the verge of intergenerational warfare, as various groups compete for scarce Government funds brought on by our massive Federal deficit. It is widely believed that the new administration will place a special emphasis on issues affecting children, in part due to First Lady Hillary Rodham Clinton's involvement in the Children's Defense Fund. While children's welfare is an important priority, we must resist the temptation to pit generation against generation in dividing up the Government pie. Instead, we must work together to find the best solutions for our society as a whole, placing special emphasis on the needs of the most disadvantaged, regardless of age.

In my work on senior volunteer programs, I have been inspired by the enormous contributions made by seniors to their communities because of their commitment to serving others. Let us not turn our back on them. Let us work together to resolve common problems, and let us recognize how important it is to bind generations together rather than split them apart.

The problems that confront us will have enormous consequences for the future, especially for those citizens who will be reaching age 65 in the next 30 years. They are problems that must be handled now so that both today's senior citizens and those who will become seniors 40 years from now can live in security.

The recent elevation of the position of administrator of the Administration on Aging to the Assistant Secretary level and the recognition of long-term care as a crucial component of comprehensive health care reform are encouraging early signals of this administration's attitude toward issues affecting senior citizens and I urge its continued attention to these and other issues affecting the elderly.

As we take stock of how far we have come during this Older Americans Month celebration, let us also take stock of the vast amount of work that remains to be done to see that those reaching their older years can remain vibrant, independent, and involved citizens of this Nation.

I would like to state that the Senate Special Committee on Aging remains dedicated to focusing on the special problems of this segment of our population.

Over the years, the committee has done an enormous amount of work not only on behalf of the elderly, but also of benefit to the Federal Treasury. It has uncovered fraud and inefficiencies in our Federal programs and proposed solutions that will save the taxpayers over \$6.5 billion in wasteful spending by 1997. The bulk of these savings, some \$6.3 billion, is the result of legislation developed by the committee that ensures that the Medicaid Pro-

gram obtains the lowest price on prescription drugs.

Another \$200 million will be saved by a measure developed by the committee that stops fraudulent billing practices by medical equipment suppliers.

Additional work by the committee over the years has resulted in significant savings to the American consumer. For example, over 60,000 citizens have requested an Aging Committee report outlining how to receive free or low-cost prescription drugs from pharmaceutical manufacturers.

The committee has developed legislation and consumer information prints protecting the elderly against marketing abuses in the complicated private MediGap and long-term care insurance markets.

Legislation was developed by the committee that strengthened the law against misleading mailings designed to dupe seniors into believing they are officially sanctioned Social Security mailings.

The committee has also begun a series of hearings on several new types of consumer frauds perpetrated against the elderly.

In the first 5 months of this year, the Aging Committee's agenda has focused on the desperate need for more options and flexibility in long-term care services for senior citizens and their families who care for them; consumer rip-offs that have targeted or disproportionately hurt the elderly; health care fraud, which accounts for up to \$90 billion a year in our health care budget; skyrocketing prescription drug cost, and their effect on senior citizens; grandparents who are raising their children due to drug abuse or violence affecting their own children; and health prevention strategies for seniors and how these measures can save billions of dollars in health care expenditures.

Since the start of the 103d Congress, the committee has also sponsored Senate-wide briefings and forums on a variety of issues, such as long-term care, prescription drugs, guardianship, health care fraud, violence against elderly women, transportation for the elderly, the appropriateness of cataract surgery, and health care reform from rural areas.

Suffice it to say that the committee continues to work on a wide variety of problems facing the aging population and to propose meaningful solutions to them. In the long run, the work of the committee benefits not just a particular segment of our population but society as a whole.

It is my privilege as ranking minority member of the Special Committee on Aging to work with Senator DAVID PRYOR on these issues. Under his able and talented chairmanship, the committee has been in the forefront in addressing issues of concern to today's senior citizens, as well as the seniors of tomorrow.

The problems of the elderly are universal—we are all growing old. Many of us are lucky enough to still have our parents or grandparents in our lives. Their concerns are our concerns.

President John F. Kennedy once said, "It is not enough for a great nation merely to add new years to life—our objective must also be to add new life to those years." All the breakthroughs in medicine and health care that result in longer life are meaningless if those additional years are spent in poverty, isolation, or despair.

And so, the Senate Special Committee on Aging remains dedicated to breathing new life into our years, not just for today's senior population but also for their children and grandchildren. I look forward to its continued contribution to improving the quality of life for millions of seniors nationwide.

Thank you, Mr. President.

RULES COMMITTEE ACTION ON THE OREGON PETITIONS

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, the Committee on Rules and Administration, in fulfilling its responsibility on the petitions related to the 1992 senatorial election in Oregon that were referred to the committee on January 5 and 20, 1993, took the following action.

The committee appointed counsel to advise and assist in the consideration of the petitions. Briefs were requested from counsels. Copies of these briefs were provided to members. After review of the briefs the committee voted to hold a hearing to receive oral arguments on the legal issues by the counsel for the petitioners and counsel for Senator PACKWOOD. Copies of the transcripts of this hearing were then provided to members. The committee then reached the stage in its consideration when it had to decide the next step—essentially whether the review should be terminated or whether to proceed with further review under the Senate's constitutional power to exclude.

Mr. President, the committee made its decision, by a unanimous vote, at its meeting of May 20, 1993, to wit that the committee take no further action on the petitions related to the 1992 senatorial election in Oregon.

All materials in this matter will become a part of the finished business records of the Committee on Rules and Administration.

I have requested the committee staff to prepare a report setting forth the committee's proceedings in this matter and stating the basis for its decision. That report will be filed in the committee records for future reference.

IRRESPONSIBLE CONGRESS? HERE IS TODAY'S BOXSCORE

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, the Federal debt stood at \$4,285,942,530.21 as

of the close of business on Wednesday, May 19. Averaged out, every man, woman, and child in America owes a part of this massive debt, and that per capita share is \$16,685.97.

SOUTH TUCSON POLICE OFFICER JOHN A. VALENZUELA

Mr. DECONCINI. Mr. President, it is with great sadness that I rise today to pay tribute to South Tucson police officer John A. Valenzuela who was shot and killed in the line of duty on Monday, May 17, 1993—the first South Tucson officer killed in the line of duty since the 1-square-mile city was incorporated in 1939.

Mr. President, we are quickly losing control of our streets and our neighborhoods to gangs, drugs, and violent crime. More than ever, America needs additional law enforcement officers and resources on our streets and in our neighborhoods.

Night after night our televisions are filled with horrifying scenes of senseless murders—none more senseless than the death of a police officer who has dedicated his or her life to protecting the very freedoms that all of us expect and enjoy.

Mr. President, we are living in a time in our Nation's history where the brave men and women of law enforcement are facing a criminal element that is well organized, well funded, and well armed—a time where law enforcement is on the front line every day reclaiming our streets and neighborhoods. Were it not for their bravery and dedication, there would be no front line to protect—no front line to defend our friends, families, and loved ones from a world in constant jeopardy.

Recently, I attended the annual National Law Enforcement Officers' Memorial Fund event in Washington, DC, to honor those men and women of law enforcement who have fallen in the line of duty—individuals who have given their lives so that we can live ours free from fear and violence.

Etched on its walls are the names of 13,296 brave men and women who gave their last full measure of devotion in order to fulfill the No. 1 priority of our Government: To protect every American citizen from violence at home and on the streets.

Mr. President, I would hope that all Americans could visit this memorial and read the inscription etched on its wall. It reads, "It is not how these officers died that made them heroes, it is how they lived." We celebrate John Valenzuela's life while mourning his tragic death.

Officer Valenzuela was a South Tucson native and a graduate of Pueblo High School. He was a former YMCA and Pima County animal control worker who spent roughly 9 months with the Tucson Police Department before joining the South Tucson force about 14 months ago.

Officer Valenzuela was a highly respected, religious man who loved working with youngsters. He had just received a promotion he considered to be an ideal job—heading the department's crime prevention unit while working as a community resource officer with youngsters at Mission View and Ochoa Elementary Schools.

Mr. President, officer Valenzuela was one of the good guys. He was a man who was devoted to his family, his fiancée Irma Madrigal, his department, and his community. This is a difficult time for all those who knew him, but his legacy of dedication to duty will live on.

Mr. President, I would like to express my deep condolences to officer Valenzuela's family, to his fiancée Irma Madrigal, and to the South Tucson force. I urge my colleagues to remember officer Valenzuela in their thoughts and prayers today.

A PLACE AMONG NATIONS

Mr. MACK. Mr. President, a year ago this February I had the opportunity to visit with one of Israel's most dynamic leaders, Benjamin Netanyahu. Many Americans will remember Mr. Netanyahu, known to Israelis as "Bibi," from his television appearances during the gulf war. In our meeting in Jerusalem, I was very impressed with Netanyahu's presentation of Israel's case. Since our meeting, Netanyahu has been elected leader of the Likud party, now the major opposition party in Israel.

This month, Netanyahu's quest to educate the world about Israel continued with the American release of his new book, "A Place Among Nations." I have reviewed the book, and I strongly recommend it, not only to every Member of Congress, but to anyone who studies or cares about Israel's struggle for existence in the Middle East.

It is hard to think of a historic conflict that has become so distorted as the Arab-Israeli conflict. Even the term "Arab-Israeli conflict" to some extent distorts the record, because it implies a symmetry that does not exist. Israel has never had a conflict with the Arab States; it is the Arab States that have objected to Israel's right to exist. "A Place Among Nations" explodes many myths surrounding the history of Israel's founding, and the repeated Arab attempts to eliminate Israel since 1948.

Mr. President, whatever your view on Israel's internal politics, this book will make a tremendous contribution to your understanding of the extraordinary story of Israel's birth and continued survival. It is one of the most eye-opening books I have seen on this issue, and I recommend it strongly to my colleagues and to all Americans.

TRIBUTE TO BETTIS RAINSFORD

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, my hometown newspaper, the Aiken Standard, recently published an editorial about my good friend Bettis Rainsford, executive vice president of Delta Woodside Industries, Inc. Bettis is one of the finest businessmen our State has produced, and the people of his home county of Edgefield, SC, are very proud of his business acumen. He has also done a tremendous amount to improve the quality of life in Edgefield and the adjoining areas.

Bettis is one of my best friends and one of the finest people I know, and I commend the Aiken Standard for paying him such a fine tribute. Mrs. Thurmond and I are thoroughly in accord with this editorial. I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the editorial be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"DOCTOR OF BUSINESS" FITTING HONOR FOR BETTIS RAINSFORD

At age 41, Bettis Rainsford of Edgefield is already a legend in his time. A distinguished educator has called him "one of the brightest young financial executives in the country, who is already well-known among all the major financial institutions."

That was four years ago, and since that time Mr. Rainsford's fame has grown further to match his 6-foot-7 frame.

It was highly appropriate that the University of South Carolina, in exercises at the USC-Aiken campus Thursday night, awarded Mr. Rainsford its honorary degree of doctor of business administration. For few businessmen can demonstrate a keener understanding of the business world than Mr. Rainsford. A graduate of Harvard University and the University of South Carolina Law School, Mr. Rainsford came home to Edgefield and organized the Edgefield Health Care Center, an 81-bed nursing home. He also bought and merged several newspapers and today owns the Citizen-News of Edgefield and the Post in North Augusta.

Mr. Rainsford's venture into the textile business occurred in 1981 at a time when the South's textile industry appeared to be dying. The old Edgefield Cotton Mill was closing, leaving 200 persons without jobs. Mr. Rainsford—who, it is said, had never even been in a textile mill—had an idea. He enlisted the interest of E. Erwin Maddrey, former Riegel Textile president, in buying the mill and converting it into a yarn mill. Out of those beginnings grew Delta Woodside Industries, Inc. The company acquired other idle plants and invested in upgrading old equipment and buying new machines. Today Delta Woodside has 31 locations in four states and Costa Rica. It employs 8,300 people and reported sales of \$705 million and earnings in excess of \$40 million last year.

The company last year also dedicated a modern new yarn mill in Edgefield and named it in honor of Mr. Rainsford.

His company, which he serves as executive vice president, chief financial officer and treasurer, has indeed "restored life to a sector of the U.S. textile industry that most textile men had given up for dead," as Forbes magazine reported in a 1989 article.

Mr. Rainsford is a lover of local and South Carolina history and is active in numerous

organizations. He is historian and treasurer of the Edgefield County Historical Society and serves on the executive council of the South Caroliniana Society. The Rainsford family in 1989 established the June Rainsford Henderson Chair of Local and Southern History at USCA, honoring his beloved aunt, since deceased.

A long-time friend, U.S. Rep. Butler Derrick of Edgefield has a fitting personal appraisal of Mr. Derrick: "Bettis is like a brother to me and is one of the finest people I've known in my life," the Congressman says. "He has drive and ambition like no one else I've known and is one of the kindest and most generous people you'll ever find."

We salute Mr. Rainsford on this distinction and USCA on its choice of a recipient for its honorary degree program.

SIS INABINET NAMED WOMAN OF THE YEAR

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the Charleston, SC, Federation of Women's Clubs recently named D. Elizabeth Inabinet—or "Sis", as she is universally known—as their woman of the year. Ms. Inabinet is an outstanding lady, and I would like to commend the federation for making such an excellent choice.

As President of the Nation's oldest chamber of commerce, the Charleston Trident Chamber of Commerce, Ms. Inabinet has been a tireless worker on behalf of the city of Charleston. She has recently been devoting the lion's share of her considerable energy to organizing the local effort to save our Navy facilities, and she has been a formidable advocate.

Mr. President, Sis Inabinet is a woman of character and courage, a talented, energetic and articulate representative for Charleston and our State, and we are proud of her. I ask unanimous consent that an article from the Charleston Post and Courier be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SIS INABINET NAMED WOMAN OF THE YEAR

D. Elizabeth "Sis" Inabinet was named Woman of the Year by the Charleston Federation of Women's Clubs. The ceremony took place Tuesday night at the group's annual meeting at the Marriott hotel.

She was honored for her work to benefit the community and for her involvement with an assortment of civic clubs and organizations.

As the first woman president of the nation's oldest Chamber of Commerce, Inabinet has played a key role in the "In Defense of Charleston" campaign to keep the local Naval facilities from closing.

Inabinet made a presentation to the Base Closure and Realignment Commission when it visited Charleston. Her topic was community infrastructure, i.e. how the area is well-suited and cost-effective for the Navy.

Most people may know her from that highly visible effort to keep the Navy here, but for years she has been serving the community in other ways.

Inabinet was chairman for the Trident United Way's 1991-92 campaign and continues

to volunteer with that organization. She has served on the executive and fundraising committees of the Charleston Symphony.

In addition to her work with the chamber, she has been active in other economic development initiatives for the Trident area. She serves as the city of Charleston's appointed representative to the Trident Economic Development Authority, is active in the Berkeley County Economic Development Council and works with Charleston's headquarters committee to attract corporations to the area.

In the field of higher education, she has helped to shape nearly every local institution, serving on the College of Charleston's Foundation Board, Charleston Southern University's Board of Visitors, the Trident Technical College Foundation Board of Trustees and the Medical University's scholarship committee.

Inabinet's other activities include the Charleston Rotary Club, the Charleston Manufacturers Club, the South Carolina Historical Society, the Gibbs Museum of Art, the Charleston Museum and the Ansonborough Neighborhood Association.

In addition, she has participated in an assortment of leadership training seminars and workshops, including Women's Vision 2000 at Columbia College and Leadership Trident.

Inabinet is Southern Bell's director of corporate and external affairs for the Coastal Region. She was the first woman to become district manager in Charleston and the first female Charleston district engineer during her career of more than 20 years with the company.

A native of Orangeburg County, she graduated from James Island High School and attended the College of Charleston.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The period for morning business is now closed.

CONGRESSIONAL SPENDING LIMIT AND ELECTION REFORM ACT OF 1993

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will now proceed to the consideration of S. 3, the Congressional Spending Limit and Election Reform Act of 1993, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 3) the Congressional Spending Limit and Election Reform Act of 1993.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, today we start a new chapter in the debate on campaign finance reform. We hope it will be the beginning of the last chapter, and I believe this is an issue where most Senators want to pass reform legislation and move forward.

We read a lot about term limits. We have heard a lot about chairmanship limits. But Mr. President, these are not the real concerns of the American people. The real concern is that undue influence is being bought every day in this town. Americans want a govern-

ment that emphasizes the public interest, not the special interest. They believe that campaign financing is out of control, excessive, and unduly influencing Senators and Representatives. And that is what this bill is all about. It is about reforming our political system.

President Clinton has been wise to make political reform a priority. I think it is clear that political reform must occur if we are to reconnect the American people with their Government, and our constituents have clearly demanded political reform.

The business that we do in the Senate is a product of the way we do business. If we expect to produce meaningful legislation to reduce the deficit, or reform health care, or address the many other issues which face our country, we must begin by looking at the system which produces this legislation. As President Clinton said in his State of the Union Address,

We must begin again to make Government work for ordinary taxpayers, not simply for organized interest groups. And that beginning will start with real political reform.

These same sentiments were expressed by Ross Perot during the campaign, who said "before we can hope to eliminate our deficit, we have to overhaul the political system that created it." So I think there is very clear and widespread agreement that we must make political reform a reality.

Mr. President, I believe we have taken significant steps in the right direction already this year. We have passed meaningful reform of the way lobbyists conduct business by passing the Lobbying and Disclosure Act earlier this month. And just yesterday, we made significant advances in simplifying and improving our voting registration procedures when President Clinton signed the motor-voter bill into law.

But we must do much more. Reform of our election laws must be an essential component of the political reform agenda. Mr. President, when most Americans think about participating in the political process, they think about voting. Voting participation was up significantly in the last election. Some Americans even think about volunteering for campaigns, by stuffing envelopes or distributing bumper stickers or putting up yard signs. And more recently, when some Americans think of participating in the political process, they think of calling in to a television or radio talk show.

But there is only a very small fraction of Americans, Mr. President, who equate participating in the political process with pulling out their checkbooks. Only a select few even have this option. But when most Americans think about what is wrong with the political process, they can think of only three things: money, money, and more money.

Mr. President, 1992 congressional election spending jumped an incredible

52 percent, to \$678 million. Let me repeat that. House and Senate candidates in 1992 spent an incredible \$678 million.

Americans know money talks. And Americans believe Congress is awash in special interest money. They think they have a pretty good idea of how this place operates and what is wrong. Americans know political reform must take place before we can solve our most complex problems.

Mr. President, this debate is about reforming ourselves. Americans are losing patience on this issue. I find that Americans understand how serious the budget deficit issue is. They are demanding immediate signs of progress on this issue, and we must begin to bring the deficit numbers down. But they understand it will not be solved overnight. The same is true of health care, and crime, and welfare reform, and so many other issues which face us. Americans demand progress, but they know these complex problems will not be solved overnight.

But when it comes to the way we act, Mr. President, Americans have no patience for excuses. Americans are tired of excuses. Americans are tired of entrenched incumbents. And Americans are tired of our inability to regulate our own conduct when it comes to controlling the flow of money into our campaigns.

In many ways, Mr. President, this debate is as much about term limits as it is about money. I have not favored term limits, Mr. President, because I believe they are a diversion from our real problems. I believe they are a quick fix solution which will have little relation to the ability of Congress to solve problems. In many ways, they will make problem solving more difficult. But in a certain way, Mr. President, they are a rational reaction from Americans. It is a reaction where Americans are essentially telling us, "if you can't even solve your own problems, we will solve them for you. If you can't figure out how to control yourselves, we will figure it out for you." Fourteen States had term limit initiatives on the ballot in 1992, and all 14 succeeded.

In my view, every time we filibuster, we are boosting the term-limit movement. Every time we see gridlock, we are boosting the term-limit movement. Every time Americans hear about special interest loopholes, we are boosting the term-limit movement. And every election when we see more special interest money flowing into our campaigns, we are boosting the term-limit movement.

So Mr. President, we have some obvious choices. If we fail to limit spending, the American people will limit us. Limit special interests, or the American people will limit us.

Now Mr. President, the opponents of this legislation will make some interesting arguments. In my view, these

arguments are out of step with the perception of the average Americans.

First, Mr. President, opponents of spending limits will say there is no money chase. We have all heard that a winning Senate race requires a sitting Senator to raise \$13,000 per week for every week of a 6-year term. But opponents of this legislation will point out that, on average, 80 percent of the money is raised in the last 2 years of a Senator's term. From this figure, they conclude that there is no money chase.

Mr. President, that is not the conclusion that I draw. In fact, this means the money chase is even worse than we thought. If 80 percent is raised during the last 2 years, Mr. President, this means a sitting Senator must raise almost \$35,000 per week. That is \$5,000 every single day for 2 straight years. So at any given time, Mr. President, up to one-third of the Members of this body are running around trying to raise \$5,000 per day every day. The money chase is even worse than we thought. When do Senators have time to raise all this money?

Second, Mr. President, opponents of this legislation actually made the claim last year that we have a downward spiral of campaign spending. I think anyone making this argument today runs the risk of losing all credibility. In the 1990, overall total spending for winning Senate races actually did go down slightly. But this was for obvious reasons—because there were no races in big States like California, Florida, New York, Ohio, and Pennsylvania, and there were fewer candidates. Spending per voter continued to surge.

But 2 years ago, Mr. President, opponents of this legislation said we should focus only on total spending. Ignore the big State races and the number of candidates. This year, opponents of this legislation will say the opposite. They will say ignore the total spending figures, even though they surged. Look at the big State races and the number of candidates, they will say. Mr. President, I do not care how they exploit the numbers, the clear trend on spending is up, up, up. In 1980, election spending was \$239 million. Last year it was \$678 million. In 1980, winning Senate candidates spent \$40 million. Last year, it was \$124 million. I don't care how you slice it. The only downward spiral has been in the quality of campaigns, not in the quantity of money.

Third, opponents will also say Americans oppose public financing. This is quite true. But they also support spending limits in much higher numbers. We have the choice between the lesser of two evils. If someone can show me workable spending limits which will satisfy the Supreme Court without public funding, please show me. The American people will love the plan. I just have not seen it yet.

Fourth, opponents also say this bill trashes the first amendment. Mr.

President, all we have heard is a rehashing of the arguments used more than 15 years ago to oppose the Presidential system of spending limits. The Supreme Court has upheld voluntary spending limits in the past, and that is what we must design today.

Fifth, Mr. President, we will hear the outrageous claim that this bill helps incumbents. Compared to what? Compared to the current system? Mr. President, just look at the 1992 Senate elections to find out how weak this argument is: 23 of 27 incumbents won reelection; 22 of 27 Senate incumbents raised more than the spending limits of this bill. Only four challengers were able to raise more than the spending limits of this bill, and ironically, all four lost.

Yet nearly all challengers would have had additional resources under this bill. I agree that challengers need a minimal amount of resources in order to compete. This bill provides great assistance in that regard. But to suggest that challengers simply need to spend more than these spending limits in order to win ignores the facts, including four races in 1992. Challengers need resources to compete, but if all we give them is more resources, incumbents will simply raise even more money. There is probably not a single Member in this body who cannot outraise a challenger. The success of challengers depends more on how competitive their spending level is with the incumbent than on simply how much they spend.

It may be ironic that the majority party in this body supports this legislation. With the additional resources we give to challengers in this bill, I cannot understand how a majority party will benefit. The present playing field is so tilted to incumbents that, by definition, the majority party benefits. But this legislation is the right thing to do. It is in the public interest.

Finally, opponents of this bill will suggest that academics oppose spending limits. We are not elected to represent academics. But I must tell you, when my constituents overwhelmingly support one view and academics support another, the ivory tower is almost always wrong. I trust the wisdom of my constituents, and they want spending limits.

So Mr. President, I believe the arguments against spending limits are shallow. They are incumbents' arguments. They are attempts to hide the real motives of the opposition to this bill—that some in this Chamber believe the current system will get them reelected. That is what this debate is about.

Our choice is simple: cap money or chase money. I know what my constituents want. And I know what they consider to be real political reform. It is time we listen to our constituents. Either we give them spending limits, or they will give us limits of their own. I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Who seeks recognition?

Mr. McCONNELL addressed the Chair.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. McCONNELL].

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, it is May, and it seems to me that every May for the last few years we have been dealing with campaign finance reform. At a time when the American people would like us to deal with the really significant issues confronting this country, the Senate, once again, is going to spend a week or two on an issue that is clearly not on the radar screen of the American people, and with good reason.

Having spent a lot of time on this issue, I get invited periodically to be on various TV shows and radio shows about the subject. Yesterday morning on C-SPAN, I was invited to be on their morning call-in show on the subject of campaign finance reform. It was interesting, Mr. President, that a substantial number of the callers did not want to talk about that. They wanted to talk about the President's economic plan. They wanted to talk about the future of the country. They wanted to talk about whether their taxes were going up, and they wanted to know whether we were going to do anything to cut spending. I said to each of those callers that they had their priorities in the right place.

Even on a call-in show dedicated to the subject of campaign finance reform, the callers knew that what we ought to be talking about was doing something about this massive debt with which we are confronted. What we ought to be talking about is doing something about stopping the biggest tax increase in history, which the President has proposed. And what we certainly ought not to be talking about is a proposal that is the most unpopular thing we can possibly do in this environment.

My good friend from Kentucky referred to what he was hearing from our constituents in Kentucky. We get a poll every April 15 across America. It is the most complete, the most accurate poll ever taken in this country on any subject. Every April 15, the American public decides on its income tax return whether or not it wants to check off \$1 of taxes already owed, not a new dollar, not a dollar on top of taxes already owed, but a dollar of taxes already owed to pay for the Presidential taxpayer-funded campaign.

We have watched the trend from 29 percent when it began in the mid-seventies down to 17 percent checking off today. They do not want to send a dollar they already owe to political campaigns. And in the Commonwealth of Kentucky, the constituents whom my friend and I represent together, only 10

percent check off. The national average is 17, and in Kentucky, only 10 percent of the people are willing to send a dollar of taxes they already owe to have taxpayer funding of elections.

So we know where the American people are on this issue, Mr. President. It is absolutely and abundantly clear. We know we have a \$4 trillion debt. We know the President is asking us to raise every American's taxes, the biggest tax increase in history. And yet what are we going to spend a week or two on? Why, congratulations American public, we are getting your message. In response to what you are telling us, we are going to start a new taxpayer-funded entitlement program for us, the ultimate perk. Oh, they are going to love it, Mr. President. They are excited about it. They cannot wait for this one. This is exactly what they expect us to do. This is right out of the playbook—right out of the playbook.

And those people who expressed their dissatisfaction last year by voting for Ross Perot, who were extremely unhappy with us about a variety of different things, they have noted that Ross Perot has not endorsed this turkey. They have noted that Ross Perot is not suggesting that it is reform of Congress to start a new taxpayer-funded program for our campaigns.

Now, Mr. President, I am totally confident, based on the fact that we have the biggest poll ever taken in America every single year, that nothing enrages the American public, nothing outrages the American public more than the possibility that we would even contemplate starting a new taxpayer-funded entitlement program for our campaigns. And so it is with that backdrop in mind, Mr. President, that we begin this year's debate. One more time we are going to spend days of the Senate's time on the least popular idea that I have heard proposed around here in my 8 years in the Senate.

Bill Clinton went coast to coast last year promising to "change welfare as we know it." Well, President Clinton certainly is changing welfare but not in the ways voters envisioned. Yesterday, he signed into law a measure to turn the welfare state into the department of voter registration via the unfunded mandates within the agency-based provision of the so-called motor-voter bill.

Second, he devised a campaign finance bill to enlarge the welfare state to include a massive new entitlement program for us, for politicians. I can hardly wait to see what comes next—probably the so-called Hatch Act reform. Another misnomer, it would actually overturn a reform that has served this country very well for over 50 years. Of course, Hatch Act reform just would not have quite the same dogooder ring to it. In any event, it will help ensure that welfare is not changed in a way truly helpful to recipients and

taxpayers, meaning a streamlined cheaper bureaucracy.

Now, Mr. President, let us talk about food stamps for politicians. That is the hallmark of the bill before us. This bill is not reform. This bill is not reform. This bill must be some kind of joke. We cannot be serious. At a time when the American public is saying to do something about the deficit, cut spending first; at a time when only yesterday a key member of the President's party bolted on the tax bill because it did not cut spending enough; at a time when the President has people in the House, in the Democratic Party, saying, "Mr. President, let us go back and take another look at this and cut spending first," we want to start a new program for us. This cannot be serious.

This country faces a \$4 trillion national debt. Talk about a credit card. We have already mortgaged our children's future. Now we are working on the grandkids. Maybe inherited debt builds character. Maybe that is the notion. Some of us had to walk a mile in the snow to get to school. Our grandkids will have to wade through a few trillion dollars of 20th century national debt to get to college.

So what if we are \$4 trillion in the hole? It is only money. Better yet, it is somebody else's money, another generation's money. Having dismissed the debt, we can now create a new entitlement program to pay for political campaigns because, darn it, we are busy people. Campaign fund raising is tiresome.

The administration says middle-class taxpayers will not be hit with this bill because we are going to repeal the lobbyist expense tax deduction, a veritable windfall, a twofer at that. We get to bash lobbyists and collect \$900 million over 5 years to pay for our political campaigns.

Now, Mr. President, most people with a hefty credit card debt who came into a windfall through inheritance, a lottery jackpot, a raise, they would first pay that personal debt down. But what do we do? Having discovered a tax deduction, hereafter known as a loophole, that we can safely repeal, why, we will create a new entitlement program for us. What a great idea.

This administration's rationale in using the savings from a tax-deduction repeal to create a new entitlement program for politicians certainly does not bode well for ever getting the debt down.

Now, the President says this will not cost middle-class taxpayers. We heard him say that. May I remind him that any funds derived from any savings anywhere, they do not belong to us but to the U.S. Treasury, the trust fund set up by and for the American people.

Of course, I do not doubt that the administration has thoroughly focus-grouped this rationale and think they can get away with it. We will probably

hear some poll cited suggesting that Americans support the President's plan. My colleagues should keep in mind that poll responses depend on how you ask the questions. And if enacted, this program will last a whole lot longer than those focus groups did. Since congressional elections are held every 2 years, the failures of this bill will become evident much faster than in the Presidential system with its quadrennial elections.

We can call it reform. Who will know? The evening news and all the papers will just talk in broad terms about a reform debate. Hardly anyone will actually read the bill. We could call it a democracy stimulus package, even though it is quite the opposite, and most people would not know the difference. The truth did not get in the way of calling the President's pork package a jobs bill.

We can bash the fat cats. We can tell the people it is good for them. "Yes, the taxpayer funding is a bitter pill, but it will save money in the long run. No more scandals, no more money chase. We will then work for the people," we can say.

Of course, people will still gripe about the taxpayer funding part. They may not be able to swallow it if the Btu tax increase is still stuck in their craw, as I suspect it will be for some time. A few hundred million per election, three-tenths of \$1 billion or four-tenths of \$1 billion to us insiders, but people who have not been in the Federal Government might think that is a lot of money. They do not realize that for professional Government people it is like seeing a dirty penny in the street; it hardly seems worth bothering about.

But we can deal with such nit-picking by saying that it is really not costing anything because we have an offset. We repeal the tax deduction for lobbying expenses, a loophole we will call it. We closed a tax loophole. And with the proceeds we are going to pass this great campaign finance reform bill that will take Government away from the special interests and give it to the people. Power to the people. It sounds pretty good.

It is a little risky. Some people, before the Senate can pass this thing, might wonder, why, if the Government is held hostage by the special interests, we would not just take it back by just sheer force of will. Do we have to repeal a tax deduction in order to buy Congress the political backbone to deal with the real problems facing the country?

This bill is being sold as some sort of special interest defense initiative [SIDI], save us from ourselves, save us from these special interests crawling all over Capitol Hill.

Even worse, some small-minded types might conclude that the proceeds saved from repealing the tax deduction for

lobbying expenses could be put to some other purpose. Why, the savings could be applied to the deficit. Or maybe they will read about this bill over breakfast, look at their omelet and think about the White House Easter egg roll and all the children in this country who have not been vaccinated against killer diseases. Maybe we should use this repeal money for that.

Mr. President, the savings from the repeal could pay for a lot of vaccinations, or school breakfasts, or AIDS research, or real food stamps for people with real problems, not us.

Not to worry. We will just have to remind them about the long-term dividend. It is a bitter pill but wash it down with these floor statements and a couple of New York Times editorials and there will be no aftertaste.

Besides, Americans are not taxed as much as people in Europe. Heck, they only work until May to cover their tax bills. What do they do with the rest of the year anyway?

Now, Mr. President, having observed the debacle known as the President's stimulus package, one might at least expect that a basic lesson would have been learned on the part of the majority party: Bipartisan consultation. Alas, once again that basic ingredient is missing from the majority party's campaign finance proposal. While there may have been some attempt to pick off a few Republicans, there was no serious effort to work with the Republican Party to craft a bipartisan bill.

The cynic might conclude there was no bipartisan effort because this is a partisan effort to pass a partisan bill, and barring that to at least come away from the debate having seized the high ground on the issue.

In 1990, 1991, and 1992, the Senate passed politically correct veto bait campaign finance bills secure in the knowledge that a Republican President would veto it. Now we have before us politically correct filibuster bait.

If there is anything we have learned around here the last few years in regard to campaign finance reform, it is this: Taxpayer financing and spending limits are poison pills. Spending limits are anathema to Republicans and virtually every nonpartisan scholar who has seriously studied the issue. They do not work. Furthermore, taxpayer financing of political campaigns is totally repugnant to the taxpayers and their guardians in Congress.

Put those poison pills—taxpayer financing and spending limits—aside and we could compromise on other provisions to craft a meaningful, real campaign finance reform bill.

Mr. President, rather than a serious effort to pass a bipartisan bill, what we have before us again is the old campaign finance reform scam—a bill larded with poison pills in the hope, particularly on the House side, that Republicans will block it.

Hundreds of Democrats in the House of Representatives are praying that Senate Republicans block this bill. They do not want to vote on this taxpayer funded entitlement program for politicians. They do not want to go first in passing a campaign finance bill.

The guardians of gridlock on this issue are those who insist on spending limits and taxpayer financing. Sound-ing reformist, they reap the benefits of the status quo. It is a darned good scam.

But just in case Republicans take the Washington Post's advice and "call their bluff" by letting the bill go through, it was tuned up to make sure that it is a pro-Democrat bill—not pro-democracy, pro-Democrat. It almost looks like a win-win for Democrats. Almost.

Unfortunately, for the bill's proponents, taxpayer financing of congressional campaigns is as unpopular as congressional pay raises. The more people hear about it, the madder they get. The administration knows that and it is going to great lengths to conceal the extent to which American taxpayers get hit with this bill.

In fact, incumbents do not get hit by this bill. Special interests do not get hit. Taxpayers get hit.

Mr. President, we hear a lot about how the spending limits in this bill are voluntary. In fact, the spending limits in the President's bill are about as voluntary in the eyes of a candidate as an armed robber's demands are in the eyes of their victims. The candidate forks over his first amendment rights, and the robber's victim forks over their wallet. Either way, they have been mugged.

Evidently, the U.S. Constitution did not fare too well in the administration's focus groups.

The committee report on S. 3, the blueprint for the President's bill, states "Public financing, as we have come to think of it, would be used only on an occasional basis, as a form of protection to candidates who agree to the limits but whose opponents exceed them."

A "form of protection," Mr. President? Protection from what? The first amendment?

Semantics. Sometimes this is really a war of words. My colleagues on the other side call it public funding. Republicans call it taxpayer funding. That is what it is. The bill's proponents talk about inducements. Republicans and constitutional scholars call the same provisions penalties. Evidently, it is in the eye of the beholder.

Mr. President, I am confident the Supreme Court would behold it as I do—as voluntary in name only. In fact, there is an all-out assault on the first amendment. In fact, this whole issue is about the first amendment.

The President's bill, like its predecessors, does not pass the Buckley test.

It is not truly voluntary. There is an up-front inducement in the form of communication vouchers. Its similarities with the Presidential system pretty much end there. Because, under this bill, if a candidate chooses to exercise his first amendment right not to quantify his speech, then all kinds of bad things begin to happen.

Bad thing No. 1: you lose the 50-percent broadcast discount. You lose the communication vouchers. Listen to this. If you decide you want to speak as much as you want to, which the Constitution permits, you have to run a disclaimer in all your ads indicating if you are a schmuck or somehow ethically challenged in not agreeing to your spending limit. If they spend one penny over the spending limit, their eligible opponent receives a taxpayer-funded grant equal to one-third of the general election limit. Spend one penny over 33 1/3 percent of the limit, and your opponent receives another grant equal to one-third of the general election limit. You spend one penny over 66 2/3 percent of the limit and their opponent receives another grant equal to one-third of the general election limit. And they will watch as their opponent receives communications vouchers to counteract independent expenditures.

Mr. President, that is not voluntary. It is coercive. Candidates who chose to exercise their first amendment rights get mugged by this bill.

The proponents try to fuss the constitutional issue up by calling these penalty provisions inducements or contingent public financing. Even some of their own literature on the bill admits the coercive nature of these provisions. The committee report on S. 3 speaks of "contingent public financing" and even admits on page 17 that "this amount of assistance may appear coercive * * *."

Yes, it certainly would appear coercive to any candidate considering not taking the taxpayer's money to run his campaign.

The report goes on to state that "This provision of public funds to an eligible candidate is intended to provide an additional incentive to a candidate to accept the limits of the bill and to provide a disincentive to a candidate to exceed those limits."

A disincentive, Mr. President? This is a penalty. In fact, penalties are the most effective disincentives.

The authors of this bill find themselves in something of a box. Full taxpayer funding—and I might say the Clinton version as compared to the earlier version of S. 3 does have more taxpayer funding. Full taxpayer funding is unpopular with the taxpayers yet essential in order to establish a constitutional, truly voluntary, spending limit scheme.

So what we have here is the system in which the up-front costs, inducements—communication vouchers and

matching funds—have been minimized to some extent although we still think it will cost \$1 billion over 6 years. But the penalties for not authorizing the spending limits have been maximized.

If we are ever to pass a real reform bill, it would be advisable to step back from the rhetoric and figure out just what it is reform should accomplish. Just what is it reformers hope to achieve?

The committee report on S. 3 as marked up in the Rules Committee states that the purpose of the bill is "to reduce the deleterious influence of large contributions on our political process, to facilitate communication by candidates with the electorate, and to free candidates from the rigors of fundraising."

Mr. President, the President's bill is way wide of those markers. It enhances the influence of large contributors by limiting what hard money candidate's campaigns can spend while leaving open the nonparty soft money spigot that pours tens of millions of dollars into the electoral process. It is a veritable gag rule on candidates through spending limits based on voting-age population.

It may free some incumbents from the rigors of fundraising, but that is hardly a compelling reason to use taxpayers' dollars to create an entitlement program for politicians. And, in fact, candidates who have relied on expensive forms of fundraising such as direct mail likely will be forced to move toward low overhead but time-intensive forms of fundraising such as personal telephone solicitations of high dollar donors.

Mr. President, the concern over the rigors of fundraising stems from the myth that there is a money chase where incumbents raise thousands of dollars day-in and day-out each and every week of their 6-year term. It is just not true. Senators serving full terms in the classes of 1986, 1988, 1990, and 1992 collectively raised over 80 percent of their reelection funds in the last 2 years of their terms.

Take my friend and colleague from Kentucky. In his reelection in 1992, he raised \$37,966 in the first 2 years of his 6-year term, \$50,937 in the second 2 years of his 6-year term, and \$2,317,149 in the last 2 years of the 6-year term.

My colleague's experience was virtually identical with that of all others. And he, like all the rest of us, made a voluntary decision about who to accept money from. Some Senators and some candidates do not take PAC money, for example. Some do. It is a voluntary decision each of us make. My colleague had \$809,483 from individual donors, and \$1,312,902 from PAC donations.

The point I am making here, Mr. President, is we each have the option as to whether or not we want to spend every minute of all of our time throughout a 6-year term raising

money. We each have the option of whether or not we want to accept contributions from individuals or from PAC's and in whatever percentage we want to. But nobody makes Senators—and there is no evidence that Senators are out raising money each year of a 6-year term. There just is not any such evidence.

The most bizarre claim in the committee report on S. 3 is that one of the purposes of the bill is to facilitate communication by candidates with the electorate.

The basic premise behind S. 3 is that spending is corrupting, spending is bad, and therefore must be severely limited. The primary purpose of S. 3 is to limit candidate spending particularly Republican campaign spending. Since the Supreme Court ruled in *Buckley versus Valeo*, and most observers agree, that campaign spending is speech. It is speech. A limit on campaign spending is a de facto limit on candidate speech.

The President's bill most certainly does not facilitate candidate speech.

That misrepresentation of this taxpayer-funded spending limit scheme exemplifies the spend control that characterizes this debate. For proponents of spending limits, reality became irrelevant long ago and only perception now matters.

Mr. President, reality does not argue for this bill.

The reality is that we really do not spend all of that much on political campaigns in this country relative to other Western democracies. Samuel L. Popkin, professor of political science at the University of California in San Diego, argued this point in an article entitled "We Need Loud Campaigns: Because That's the Only Way Americans Will Pay Attention" which appeared in the *Washington Post* on December 1, 1991.

He said:

As for the argument that America already spends too much on elections, the fact is that American elections are not costly by comparison with those in other countries. Comparisons are difficult, especially since most countries have parliamentary systems, but it is worth noting that reelection campaigns to the Japanese Diet, their equivalent of our House of Representatives, cost at least eight times as much per vote as our congressional elections. Indeed scholars estimate that Diet elections cost between \$50 and \$100 per constituent. * * *

Mr. President, an equally valid comparison is between campaign spending and spending on consumer products, and the advertising of those products. While congressional election spending was \$678 million in 1992, total expenditures for all advertising in the United States last year was \$44 billion—\$44 billion. Campaign spending was a drop in the bucket compared to that.

Soda pop advertising expenditures, diet and regular, totaled \$470. Automobile advertising totaled \$3 billion. It is tough for campaigns to compete for

attention with all those flashy product ads. Campaign spending pales in comparison with annual consumer spending. Bottled water: In 1991, Americans spent \$2.6 billion on bottled water. Yogurt: In 1992, Americans spent \$1.7 billion on yogurt; \$1.7 billion on potato chips; \$600 million on bubble gum; and \$4.8 billion on pet food.

Mr. President, congressional campaign spending in 1992 was up 52 percent over 1990, a phenomenal increase. There was also a 68-percent increase in the number of congressional candidates, which most of us would applaud. We had 1,759 candidates in 1990; we had 2,956 candidates in 1992. That is a truly astonishing figure—a 68-percent increase in the number of candidates from 1990 to 1992.

Competition flourished; democracy flourished; and campaign spending flourished. Voter turnout, electoral competition, and campaign spending all dramatically increased in 1992. Why? Because there were competitive Senate races in several large States—two Senate elections in California alone. More incumbents than usual faced serious competition from well-funded challengers. I do not know anybody who thinks that would be bad. Retirement stemming from the House Bank scandal, among other factors, increased the number of free-for-all open seat contests. Democracy, when thriving, is expensive, because people participate.

Clearly, spending is not the problem with the electoral process in this country. Clearly, the President's taxpayer-funded spending limits bill is a gross waste of taxpayer dollars. He was just up on the Hill the other day, fighting to pass the largest tax increase in U.S. history. Now we have before us a bill to create a taxpayer-funded entitlement program for politicians.

The timing is ironic, to say the least. This bill is clearly unconstitutional. But put all that aside. Even if you dismiss the cost to the taxpayers, even if you dismiss the assault on the Constitution, what have you got? You have a bill that only selectively limits spending.

This bill, Mr. President, is a fraud. It will limit neither total campaign spending nor special interest influence. While I oppose spending limits outright as being unconstitutional and undemocratic, the limits in the President's bill primarily limit the campaign spending that benefits Republicans, while exempting out the kinds of campaign spending that benefit Democrats.

For example, political party soft money, which has historically been used to great effect by Republicans, takes a beating in the Clinton bill. The bill takes an ax to such mom-and-apple-pie activities as getting out the vote and promoting volunteer participation.

Let us look at nonparty soft money, the real sewer money polluting elec-

tions. Nonparty soft money is spent by those awful special interests President Clinton frequently rails against.

Of course, most nonparty soft money benefits Democrats, so you will not even find one mention of nonparty soft money in the President's plan. Not a word, not one solitary word.

Moreover, since the President's bill restricts money that is spent in small, limited, and disclosed amounts—hard money—you can be sure that it will trigger an explosion of large, unlimited, and undisclosed spending in the form of more nonparty soft money and independent expenditures, all by those same evil special interests.

So, in other words, the end result of the President's bill will be even more spending and more control by the special interests than there is today.

Mr. President, this bill is a cruel hoax on the American people. They deserve better than this.

Anyone who believes passing this bill will take the heat off Congress is mistaken. Even if it were a good bill, nothing we do in this area will detract from our failure to solve the real problems looming over this country. But this is not even a good bill; it is a lousy bill. And it will look even worse if the real problems facing Americans fester for a few more years.

Mr. President, having used up a couple hours of debate on a typically uneventful Friday, we should now put this bill aside. Let us get on with dealing with the serious problems before our Nation. And while we are working on real solutions to real problems, we could also craft a bipartisan reform measure that will truly address the problems with the campaign finance system.

Mr. President, I can say from firsthand experience—having dealt with this issue now for 5 years in the Senate, and for many years before that having taught about it, written about it, thought about it, debated it, and participated in the system—that the American people are not concerned about this issue if it is dealt with in a way that discourages competition and creates a new taxpayer-funded program for us. Not only are they not concerned about it, they are outraged about it.

As I said at the beginning of my remarks, I was on a C-SPAN call-in show yesterday on this subject. A reasonable number of the callers did not want to talk about this. They wanted to talk about the real problems confronting the country. They wanted to talk about deficit reduction; they wanted to talk about high taxes; they wanted to know whether we were going to cut spending first. They wanted to talk about the real issues confronting this country.

So, once again, we are going to spend a substantial amount of time on an issue that should be dealt with on a bipartisan basis. We all know what needs

to be done. We all know what will not tilt the playing field one way or another. But we will not do it.

Once again, in May, we are slugging it out on partisan lines, going nowhere, when we could do the things that we know will create more competition, although competition is pretty healthy in the Senate already. We could lower the cost of the broadcasting advertising for candidates, which would principally benefit challengers. Instead of weakening parties, as the Clinton package would do, we could strengthen parties.

Parties are that one entity in the American political system that will support challengers. We know PAC's do not care much for challengers, unless it is labor PAC's. We know that even individual donors tilt toward incumbents. But the one entity out there in America that will stand up for every viable challenger who runs are the parties. And yet, what do we do? We want to make them weaker. We want to make them weaker.

If we are concerned about special interests, then we ought to do something about PAC's. I noted with interest that once again this year, right at the end of the debate, I mean right at the end of the period before bringing up the bill, the majority has decided to ax the PAC's in this proposal. I commend that. That was originally my proposal 3 or 4 years ago. I am glad it has now been adopted by the majority. I think that is the first step toward the kind of reform that would create a competitive system and diminish the influence of special interests.

Mr. President, I hope that at some point in the coming weeks, after we have had a chance to vote on a variety of different amendments that give people a chance to go on record on all of the myriad issues that are contained in this proposal, we will finally and at long last, after 5 years, sit down and craft and pass a bipartisan campaign finance reform bill that will be good for the two-party system, good for America, and we will not send a bill to the taxpayers.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. FORD].

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, you know it is, I guess, unusual that for the last many weeks, two Senators from the same State are on opposite sides. Fortunately—I believe fortunately—on the voter registration bill, on which we were successful, it was the right thing to do. And I am sure my colleague thought his opposition to that piece of legislation was the right thing for him to do.

Now we find ourselves on a different side. I want to say to my friend, I have never seen him giggle so much. He reads his speech, and smiles and laughs

and carries on like this is something funny. He gets his kicks by talking about food stamps, and then he talks about cat food, bubble gum, and yogurt. You know, I do not understand the relevance between trying to limit campaigns and cat food. That is his version of it. That is all right. If the Senator wants to compare this to cat food, that is perfectly all right. So I am going to give him that break.

The Senator keeps fussing about this President. That is fine. That is his prerogative. He is on the other side. He is not going to like anything that comes out of the White House, in my opinion, regardless of what it is.

The Senator talks about reducing the deficit. Well, we thought we made a pretty good start. We got a budget through that made significant cuts. Over 200 items were cut. And they will get all kinds of figures out here saying what the cuts were.

All you have to do is say I would like to get this kind of figure, and, boy, you can come up with it in a minute. I thought we did pretty well.

What we forget is that for the last 12 years—the last 12 years—we have been living under his Presidents. And we have gone from \$900 billion in debt to over \$4 trillion. He talks about a credit card. His leader made a statement a few weeks ago, they were now going to cut up that credit card. They have been living on it for 12 years. They did not have to cut it up. It was so worn, it was so thin that you would throw it away anyhow. So this credit card business we hear, it is worn out. We have to do something different, and the people want a change.

He says this bill is not on the radar screen. That is probably true. He says the economic plan for this country is on the radar screen; the future of what we are going to do and how we are going to live is on the radar screen; that education is on the radar screen; that eliminating the debt is on the radar screen. That is true—absolutely true. And I agree with him. This bill is not on the radar screen.

Think just a minute, though. One-third of our colleagues are out on the road right now. They do not want a vote on Friday, they do not want a vote on Monday, because they have to go out and chase money; 80 percent of it in these 2 years. I am sure my colleague did not hear me say that in my previous remarks. It is \$13,000 a week for 6 years, but in the 2 years it is \$35,000 a week; that is \$5,000 a day out there they are raising to run the average senatorial campaign in 1994.

So, if you squeeze it up, they are out there getting \$5,000 a day in the 2 years. Instead of \$13,000 per week it is \$35,000. So we have a third of our colleagues out there chasing money. I do not know what to do, Mr. President, to try to limit the money chase. We try—it is either unconstitutional, or we talk

about food stamps, cat food, whatever it might be, and you pile it up.

I do not know where we go from here. But I want to tell you, if we get time to stay here and work, we might find a way to eliminate the deficit. We might find a way to improve education. We might find a way to make the future better for our children and our grandchildren. But the constituents, in my opinion, want us to stop the money chase, if we can do that, and spend our time here. One-third of this Chamber is gone chasing money. We have either to cap money or continue chasing money. If we stay here and work, maybe we can begin to solve some of the problems.

Ross Perot was mentioned by my colleague. One of the issues that I stated earlier, that I quoted from his campaign, is that we have to change the political system. The way to change the political system is change the way we finance campaigns. Many of Ross Perot's leaders have endorsed this piece of legislation we are debating here today. So, I hope we can get on with this, that we can vote it up or down, try to work it out. I tried for 5 years to help work something out. It has been through my committee several times. I am not the sponsor of the bill. I am one of the cosponsors. The distinguished Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. BOREN] is the real sponsor of this legislation, along, now, with the President of the United States. We have not had that before.

We heard reference made to the stimulus package, or the jobs bill. "We should have learned a lesson from that." You can bet your sweet bippy we learned a lesson. We learned a lesson that the other side stopped everything we tried to do to create jobs. One community in my State would have gotten 3,000 new jobs, of carpenters, electricians, plumbers, bricklayers—whatever, who are looking for jobs now. But what did they do? They increased the debt by \$4 billion without a peep. Nobody on that side of the aisle voted or raised his or her voice—increased the deficit \$4 billion.

Talk about reducing the deficit. Do you know what they voted for to increase the deficit by \$4 billion? They extended unemployment compensation. There are those who are out of work out there, still sitting in their chairs on their porches, drawing from taxpayers without doing a thing. They would rather work, though. They would rather work than draw taxpayers' dollars. So we increased the deficit here by \$4 billion instead of giving people an opportunity to go to work.

It is 12 years of a credit card that is worn out. We talk about it like everything just happened in the last 3 or 4 months. I have never seen anything like it. They are trying to create President Clinton in the image of President Bush. They will help us with the Mexi-

can Free-Trade Agreement. They will help us with foreign affairs. They will help us with foreign aid. They will do all these things. But they will not help domestically. That is the well that gives us the strength to be the leader in the world. If we are not strong domestically, we are not going to continue to be the leader in the world we have been. So let us wise up. Let us try to do some things that strengthen this country.

They say this bill will not help any, it is unconstitutional, first amendment rights. I got all that. I am not a lawyer. If I was on a jury, I would just try to make a decision from what I have heard. And what I heard from constituents is they want to stop the money chase. It may not be on the radar screen, but I guarantee if they thought this would help us stay here and work a little longer, work a little harder, get better ideas in order to reduce the deficit, increase the economic condition of this country, they would be overwhelmingly for it.

Every time you heard somebody say that is unconstitutional, somebody else files a paper and says it is constitutional. You know, I get a little bit confused. It just reminds me, when I turned around to a lawyer one day and asked him, "Which way should we go on this question?" The lawyer said, "Go either way. We will make a good case out of it." That is kind of what I hear here. "It is unconstitutional." "Oh no, it is not unconstitutional." Let us lay it on the board. Let us get it started.

We talk about strengthening parties. I hear that: strengthening parties, giving money. The only change in party activity is to require it to be funded by hard money, not soft money—hard money, reported money raised pursuant to Federal requirements and limits and higher limits for State fundraising. And we increase the amount of money going to the grass roots effort in this bill. I do not understand how we are not helping parties. I do not understand how we are not helping local grassroots efforts by this, when you increase the amount. The only thing we have changed is that it is hard money; you have to report it. Is there something sinister about soft money that you do not want to report it? You are against this because it is hard money and you have to report it? Shucks, I do not mind reporting it.

"The Court will not uphold this. The Court will find this unconstitutional."

The Supreme Court has upheld as voluntary the full public funding in general elections. The bill provides only partial funding. The Presidential election is supposed to be fully funded from public funds, taxpayers' dollars. The past President received over 200 million taxpayers' dollars to run for office, and I did not hear any squeals about that. But, boy, if you want to do

this, you are against it—that is when you begin to hear them all.

So this bill does not limit how much a nonparticipating candidate can raise. Go ahead and raise \$5 or \$6 million for a race for the Senate in Kentucky; raise \$20 million for a race in California. Go on, go out there and get it. You are not here doing your job. You are out chasing money. If you want the money chase to continue, do not help this bill. If you want to put a cap on expenditures and say you need to be here and need to work, then I think this bill deserves special consideration.

Mr. President, I see the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma here, who is the main sponsor of this legislation. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky yields the floor. Who seeks recognition?

The Chair recognizes the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. BOREN].

Mr. BOREN. Mr. President, first of all, I want to commend my colleague from Kentucky, the distinguished chairman of the Rules Committee, for the remarks he has just made. Our colleague, Senator FORD, is known as a person who tells it like it is. He has done exactly that to our colleagues and to the American people who might be watching us in the remarks which he has just made.

The 1992 elections were about change. They were about returning Government to the people, so that Government will work for all the people, not just the narrow interests that largely fund the campaigns of those Members running for election or reelection to the Congress of the United States.

Let me not forget that just 6 months ago, the American people spoke loudly and clearly about the need to end business as usual, about the need to end politics as usual. Let us not fool ourselves into thinking that they have forgotten our pledges to end the gridlock and to clean up the money chase in politics. The people do not just want change, they demand it.

We must know that the patience of the people is not unlimited. We saw their impatience rise to a boil in those States where the term-limit question was on the ballot. In every single one of those States, the people voted to limit the terms of Members of Congress. Why? Because the people saw what was going on. The people saw that the system was not working as it should. They looked at the fact that we were piling up billions and billions of dollars of debt on the next generation, up from a \$1 trillion to a \$4 trillion national debt in just 12 years. The people were worried and the people were frightened and the people were wondering if their children and their grandchildren would have the same economic opportunities that we have had. The people were worrying about whether or not the United States was still

going to be a leading nation in this world.

When we think about the fact that this year, for example, just the interest on the national debt will eat up 58 percent of all the private savings in this country, savings that could go to help our economy grow and to create jobs for the next generation, I have to say, Mr. President, the people were right to be worried and afraid and fearful about what might have happened. The people were right to draw up short and to say, "Get on with your job, get the job done, write a sound economic policy for this country."

When the people looked at what has been going on in the election campaigns in this country and they realized that incumbents were able to outspend challengers making it virtually impossible for new people to break into politics because those already here could raise three, four, and five times as much money mainly from the special interest groups to keep themselves here, as new people trying to break into politics could raise, the people said, "No wonder we're in trouble."

In poll after poll, the American people have been asked: Do you think Congress represents people like you, or do you think Congress represents the special interests? An overwhelming majority have said, sadly: We do not think Congress represents people like us. We think Congress represents the special interests.

When they see PAC dollars going 9 to 1 for incumbents versus challengers, and when they see we have not solved the Nation's problems, when they see the deficit is increasing, when they see our share of world trade diminishing, when they see jobs being exported out of this country, when they see Members of Congress having to become full-time fundraisers and part-time policymakers, they get so frustrated that they do not know what to do about it, and so finally they just say: Throw them all out; limit their terms.

That is an extreme solution because I think most of us understand that if you limit the time in office and the terms of office of elected people, you are mainly going to turn the power of the Government over to the hands of the nonelected bureaucrats who will be here for 20, 30, 40 years, and the people will have even less say in their Government because new people coming in take time to learn their way around this city and the ways of the bureaucracy. By the time they are trained, they will have to leave and the bureaucrats will run it all. I do not think that is the solution.

But, Mr. President, the people are dead right to be angry. They are absolutely right to express their profound uncertainty about the future direction of this country and their frustration. That is what we have seen. We ought to tell it like it is, and we ought to admit

it to ourselves in this institution that this Government is in trouble. It is not working as it should and the people have lost their patience.

If we think the people are going to forget about the way they feel or if they are going to somehow get over their worries about the future of this country, we are wrong. This was not just an election day phenomenon that caused Mr. Perot to get a high percentage of votes or which caused term limits to pass that was one of those things that surfaced on one day and is going to be forgotten tomorrow. No. The people are watching us and I am glad, because when the people get angry and when the people watch their elected representatives and when the people demand change in the right direction and when the people tell us to shape up, that gives us the best chance in the world of finally getting something done.

We are the trustees of this institution. We are the ones who have an opportunity to vote here. The people who have sent us here have a chance to vote for or against us. But all those people at the grassroots who are demanding change and reform of the political system cannot come through these doors and sit on the floor of the U.S. Senate and cast votes. We are their representatives. There are 100 of us here and the 100 of us here have the vote that they gave to us. It does not belong to us, it really belongs to them. We are just here because they sent us here. If we cannot clean up our own institution, one way or another the voters are going to clean it up for us, and they should.

Voter dissatisfaction is at an all-time high. The people made campaign finance reform an issue in the November elections. I went down and representatives of both parties went down, for example, and spoke to Mr. Perot's volunteers. It was a very interesting day. Many of them had never been in politics before.

We opened up for questions, and there were a lot of questions about budget deficits. Maybe about one-third of the questions were about budget deficits, but two-thirds of the questions and concerns expressed were about cleaning up the political system: Why is all this money being poured into campaigns? Why are people quitting their jobs in the executive branch, for example, as our trade representatives and going right out the door when they were supposed to have been working for us and go to work for foreign governments at four, five, six times the amount of money they were paid working for us? Why do you people in Congress have such a huge bureaucracy? You used to get along with 38 committees and used to get along with 2,000 or 3,000 employees. Why do you have 299 committees and thousands more employees? Why can you not get your

work done on time? Why you have created empires for yourselves? Why do you not do something to clean up the system where Members of Congress who get reelected get more than half of their campaign contributions not from the people back home, but from the special interests, political action committees, many of whom have never set foot in the home State or district of the Members they are pouring all this money to.

Those are what the questions were. That is what they asked me about. Two-thirds of the questions were about it.

If we think they are going to forget about it because the election is over, we are wrong. God help us, I hope they do not forget about it, and I hope they keep the heat on us. I hope we are conscientious enough, not just because the people are demanding it but because we ourselves know in our own hearts and minds that we are not proud of what is going on in our political system.

There have been times when I have sat in rooms where we have thought about how in the world do you raise the amount of money it takes to run for the next election. How do you come up with the \$4 million it takes on the average to get reelected? Frankly, I wanted to go home and take a bath after listening to those strategies of how you milk the money out of all those sectors you are going to have to milk in order to get the amount of money that it takes to run for reelection.

Everybody is victimized. The Members of the Congress who came here, idealistic, wanting to render a public service, wanting to bring about the right kind of change and progress for our country turned into panhandlers on the street, for sale to the highest bidder on the auction block because they have to figure out, whether they like it or not, how to raise the \$4 million to get reelected.

Then the people who get shaken down—we talk about the lobbyists. It is not their fault that because of the system we come and beat over their heads and ask them to make contributions, hold fundraisers, and raise hundreds of thousands of dollars. They are victimized, too. What about the people who pay them, or the people at the grassroots? They are the most victimized of all because they do not get full-time Members of Congress to vote to solve the problems of the country and because they do not get campaigns anymore that are decided on the basis of who has the best qualifications and the best ideas to turn this country around.

They get campaigns where competition is based mainly on who has the most money, because 99 times out of 100, the candidates with the most money win the election because they are on TV the most, they are on radio

the most, and are in newspapers the most. Who knows whether they have the best ideas, or the best character, or the best qualifications, but if they have the most money, Mr. President, whether they are a Democrat, a Republican, liberal, conservative, or whatever their ideas might happen to be, if they have the most money, 99 times out of 100 they win.

We are obligated to answer the call for reform in our Government and it is time to replace the power of the pocketbook with the power of the American voter.

Today as we begin debate on S. 3, the Congressional Spending and Election Reform Act of 1993, I am reminded of our many previous reform efforts. A decade ago, I began working on campaign finance reform with then Senator Barry Goldwater of Arizona. It was a privilege to work with him. What a great gentleman he is, and what a great Senator he was, whether you agreed with him on every issue or not, because you talk about a person of integrity who left you no doubt where he stood, that was Barry Goldwater as a Senator. He and I agreed across party lines that we had enough of what was going on and we wanted to change it.

From that time, it has been my mission to change the broken campaign finance process. There have been many efforts by others—Senator John Stennis of Mississippi, a senior Member of this Congress for many, many years, now also retired. I remember he said to me so many times,

Senator Boren, it breaks my heart that the power of the political process is being taken away from those people who cast their votes down in those precincts at home and being put in the hands of interest groups and their representatives in Washington and other power centers of this country and to see how the people become cynical about their own Government, do not believe in their own Government anymore, does not think it cares about them anymore because they know they do not have the power to make those large financial contributions.

He understood the history of this place, and he wanted to change, he wanted to purify the system, he wanted to put integrity back into it, he wanted to bring it back the way it was when he first entered the Congress. He can remember that relationship between Members of Congress and the people who sent him here.

There have been efforts by many, many others. Senator FORD, from whom we have just heard, chairman of the Rules Committee, has tried in so many ways to bring about reform, not only campaign finance reform but reform of other ways we do business in the Senate. He has taken the lead in ending some of the unfair perks and advantages that are given to Members of Congress. He has tried to restrain the use of mass mailing of newsletters and other abuses of the franking privilege year in and year out to campaign in-

stead of Members using their offices to make policy decisions.

Senator ROBERT BYRD, majority leader for much of the time when we began this effort to reform the campaign finance system, President pro tempore of the Senate, great historian of the Senate, perhaps the most knowledgeable historian of the Senate in the United States today, who because he is a historian, because he is a historian and because he knows so much about our institutions and understands how they work, sees how the pouring in of all of this money, mainly from special interests, is like a cancer eating away at the heart of this institution.

Senator MITCHELL, our current majority leader, is a great champion of reform. I have heard him talk not only on the Senate floor, but I have heard him talk in private, standing up even to those who were reluctant to change the system because the current system got them here and they know under the current system as incumbents they can raise more money than challengers. They do not want it changed. I have heard Senator MITCHELL courageously stand up for reform not only in public but in private. We all know it is one thing to make a speech on the Senate floor and portray oneself as being for reform. It is another thing when you go into the privacy of your own office or into one of the cloakrooms behind us or some places where nobody knows what you have said except you and your conscience and still stand up for reform. I have seen Senator GEORGE MITCHELL do that time and time again.

Now, of course, we are being joined by a new President in the White House, President Bill Clinton. He said during the campaign he wanted to clean up the way campaigns were financed. He did not take PAC money. He wanted to change the political culture of this country, change the whole atmosphere so that we could work together more effectively to get things done.

To his credit, Mr. President, he has not forgotten what he said during the campaign, and he has said it again publicly by endorsing and improving and toughening up this bill. And he has also said it in private, as I have worked with him in crafting this legislation. His instructions to me again and again have been, "I want real reform. Do not water it down. Do not put loopholes in it. I want real reform." Now we have a President in the White House who has pledged to sign meaningful campaign finance reform.

And so many, many people, Democrats and Republicans, have come together and have worked on this. "Mac" Mathias, from Maryland, former Republican Senator from Maryland, again one of the early supporters of campaign finance reform who left the Senate—sadly, when he left, said one of the reasons he left was he just could not bring himself to think about the time and ef-

fort and energy it would take to raise the \$5 or \$6 million he thought he would have to have in his campaign war chest to run for reelection. He did not want to spend his valuable time doing that. He wanted to spend whatever time he could trying to influence public policy.

Sadly, it is the "Mac" Mathiases of this world, good Senators, Republican and Democrat, who are the ones most conscientiously affected by this system, who often leave public service because they do not want to continue that kind of money chase.

In each Congress we have come a step closer to enacting meaningful reform. Last year, this Chamber passed a good campaign finance reform bill, which ultimately fell victim to a veto. Today, as I said, we have a President who not only embraces last year's bill but has offered improvements to it. The struggle to enact meaningful campaign finance reform has been a long one, but the end is in sight, and the people understand that the time for excuses is over. They expect dramatic and fundamental change, not more nibbling at the edges.

In the course of refining this bill, many of us have become immersed in the details. Now is the time to reflect on the larger mission, a mission that is greater than this legislation, a mission to regain the trust of the people. The bill before us is a strong reform bill. However, it does have opponents, as we have just heard from some of our colleagues. They will assert, as have asserted, that this bill is an incumbent protection plan. They use very clever sound bite words like "food stamps for politicians."

But I ask my colleagues to listen, not to sound bites, not to clever phrases, but to the substance of their arguments. Let us go beyond the rhetoric and let us focus on the facts. Statistics clearly show how the current system favors incumbents and discourages new candidates who could bring fresh ideas to Congress.

Last year, even though challengers received extraordinary financial support in race after race, incumbents outspent challengers. In Senate races, as this chart indicates, incumbents raised three times as much as challengers, \$3 raised by incumbents for every \$1 raised by challengers. In the House, the ratio was 5 to 1. Incumbents, sitting House Members—it does not matter if they are Democrats or Republicans—raised five times as much money, \$5 for every \$1 their challengers could raise. In fact, in the 1992 senatorial races, incumbents outspent challengers 92 percent of the time and incumbents prevailed 86 percent of the time.

We should not be shocked at the fact, as I said a minute ago, Mr. President, that those who have the most money usually win the elections, and those who inevitably get the most money,

Democrats or Republicans, are incumbents because people want to get in to see them, talk to them, have access to them, especially the special interest groups, and so they give them the political contributions.

The vicious race to raise money has made us part-time Senators and full-time fundraisers, and in the 1992 congressional elections spending jumped 52 percent, just in this election, to \$678 million—\$678 million poured into congressional campaign funds. Today, the average Senate winner needs to spend nearly \$4 million to win. That means a successful candidate has to raise an average of \$12,000 per week for 6 years.

Think about that. You have to sit there. You are a sitting Senator. You know you have to raise an average of \$4 million to get reelected. You have to sit down and think, not how can I get the budget deficit down, how can I provide better education for our children, how can I strengthen our Nation's security, how can we improve our transportation system, how can we get crime down in this country, no. You have also got to think about how can I raise \$12,000 this week and next week and the week after that in order to raise the amount of money it takes, on the average, to successfully get reelected.

I speak often—I know my colleagues do—to graduation ceremonies of college and high school students. I was speaking to a group of high school students from my State who were here just last week. Some of them want to go into politics. Thank God, some of them still think it is an honorable calling and they want to get to a place like this because they want to help serve the people. I did not have the heart to tell them not only to get the best education you can, learn as much as you can, learn about economic policy, learn about history, so that when you come here you can render a great service; you will be a good Senator; you will be a good Member of Congress; make yourself the best qualified man or woman you can in order to come here, come with good ideas, be of good character, stay true to yourself; maintain your integrity—I did not have the heart to also tell them, and figure out how you are going to raise \$12,000 a week, because that is what it is going to take. Figure out how you are going to raise \$4 million. Of course, at the rate of increased spending we have seen in recent campaigns, I would probably have to say, by the time you are old enough to run, figure out how you are going to raise \$10 million, because it keeps going up and up.

When I first came to the Senate—it has not been long ago—it only took \$200,000 or \$300,000 on the average to win a Senate seat. The campaign figure now is \$4 million. What it will be 20 years from now, I do not know, when these young people will be ready to

come here and make their contribution to the political system.

The only lasting and effective way to reform the campaign finance system is to place reasonable limits on how much money those running for the Senate may spend. The leadership substitute, which will be introduced shortly, caps runaway costs by setting voluntary spending limits based upon the number of voters in each State. However, under the Supreme Court's decision in *Buckley versus Valeo*, spending limits must be voluntary. Therefore, this legislation provides significant incentives in order to comply.

Mr. President, we hear a smoke-screen every time we bring up campaign finance reform. We hear the Members on the other side say, "Oh, food stamps for politicians. Oh, you are going to provide some incentives, either lower mailing or communications vouchers or something like that." Is that not terrible? That is awful. That is an awful price to pay for cleaning up the system.

Do you know why they talk about that, Mr. President? They talk about it because they have read the Supreme Court decision. They are knowledgeable. They did not just wander in here without knowing what the law is. They know what the law is, and they know that if you want to have spending limits under the Supreme Court decisions—I think unfortunately, but it is the law—you have to come up with a series of incentives to get candidates to voluntarily accept spending limits. And if you do not have incentives, you do not have spending limits.

But they do not want to talk about the real issue. They do not want to talk about the reason they are really against the bill. They throw up all these phony arguments and smoke-screens: "Food stamps for politicians."

What they really do not want is spending limits. No wonder. They are incumbents. It is not a matter of whether you are Republican or Democrat. Incumbents do not want spending limits for the most part.

Why? You see why on this chart. Incumbents can raise three times as much money as challengers in the Senate, five times as much as challengers in the House. They do not want spending limits. They want the sky as the limit. "So in case we get in a tough race I can call in all my special interest friends who had access to me over the last 6 years and I know they can pour money into my State and make sure I get reelected because the poor challenger running against me does not have access to that money." They do not want spending limits. That is the reason they throw up these smoke-screens. They want competition based upon who can raise the most money because they are already here and they know the challenger can raise more money than their opponents.

Why do they want to change? That is what this debate is all about. Let us just strip it away. Do you think the American people are fooled by smoke-screens like that? Not on your life. The American people know what we are talking about. They know we are talking about whether or not to give new people in politics a chance, whether or not to stop the money chase, whether or not to limit the obscene amount of money that is now pouring into political campaigns. Over 90 percent of the American people said we want spending limits. We want to take Congress off the auction block. We want a different kind of politics in this country. Our spending limits will help fix the system.

(Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN assumed the chair.)

Mr. BOREN. If the spending limits in the substitute had been in place in the 1992 election the average incumbent would have had to cut by a large amount the amount of money that that incumbent spent. In fact, if our bill had been in effect in the last election, sitting Members of Congress, as you can see by this chart, would have had to cut their spending by 33 percent, an average of \$1.4 million in every campaign, less spending by incumbents. The average challenger would have had to cut spending by less than 2 percent, an average of about \$36,890 per challenger.

We talk about leveling the playing field, leveling the playing field so we can give the challengers a chance to take on incumbents. People doubt that our bill would do that. Look at the facts. Our bill would have cut incumbent spending 33 percent and would have barely cut challenger spending at all. It levels the playing field. It gives new people a chance in politics.

Madam President, spending limits are not just important to campaign finance reform. They are the heart and soul of campaign finance reform. There used to be an old saying when I was growing up, kind of a joke: a daughter came to the mother said, "May I go swimming in the ocean?" The mother was a little alarmed at the idea of her daughter swimming in the ocean, it might be dangerous undertow, currents. She said, "Yes, my darling daughter, you may go swimming, but do not go near the water."

That is just about the same as saying we ought to have campaign finance reform but we are not going to have any spending limits. It is illogical and impossible. You cannot have real campaign finance reform without having spending limits. Having campaign reform is like telling the doctor you can examine the patient but you cannot provide the cure, if you have campaign finance reform without having spending limits.

People realize how essential spending limits are to fair elections. They have identified them as the most important

step in cleaning up the system. As I have mentioned polling data, the lowest I have seen is 77 percent of Americans favor spending limits. Another poll says 85 percent. I have seen polls that show over 90 percent. An overwhelmingly majority want spending limits.

Voters have targeted special interest influence as the second most essential element in campaign finance reform. We must prevent special interests from driving the political process.

PAC's contributed almost \$175 million to campaigns in the 1992 election. These PAC's know how to play the Washington power game.

Madam President, let us just think a minute. You are a director of a PAC. You have collected a lot of money here together in Washington to pour into the political process. Who are you going to give it to? Senator X, Y, or Z who is sitting here on a very important committee that affects your pocketbook, whose votes you need to protect your pocketbook, or are you going to give to that outstanding young woman or man back home, whether it is in Illinois, Oklahoma, or someplace else, brimming with new ideas and idealism who wants to come here and make a difference for the country? Unfortunately, that young woman or man sitting back home in Illinois or Oklahoma or Kansas or California or New York or wherever it is, they are not on that important committee right now. Their vote is not going to affect your pocketbook right now. You know, and if they pull a big political upset, end up winning and surprising everybody, you can just always hold a fundraiser after they are already here in Washington and make amends, help them pay off their campaign deficit.

That happens all the time, Madam President. In fact, there are many Members of Congress who have a fundraiser in Washington to pay off their deficit, new Members, before they ever get here and cast even their first vote, because money is important in politics.

So, let us look at the fact. The PAC money? Of course; it goes to the people that are here, that are already here, that can affect the pocketbooks of those people on those powerful committees.

Let us look at the fact. That is not the theory. As we can see from this chart in the 1992 elections where did the PAC money go? Six dollars to incumbents in the Senate, for every \$1 that PAC's gave to challengers, 6 to 1. It did not matter if they were Democrats, Republicans, liberals, conservatives. If they are an incumbent on a powerful committee that can affect the pocketbook interests of the people served by those PAC's, they give the money to the people to help them, that can help their interests; \$6 per \$1. What about the House: \$10 to \$1. The House PAC's gave \$10 to incumbents for every \$1 that they gave to challengers.

If challengers are to have a chance, the disproportionate influence of PAC's must be eliminated. Our bill does just that. Under our plan we would completely ban PAC contributions to those running for Congress; no more will they be allowed to drown out the strength of the individual vote or the person back home at the grassroots. The substitute goes even further beyond the role of special interests. We adopt the President's proposal to ban lobbyists from making or soliciting contributions for any Member of Congress whom they have lobbied within the proceeding 12 months and we also decrease the individual limits for annual contributions to PAC's from \$5,000 to \$1,000.

The leadership substitute addresses a number of other greatly needed reforms. The substitute would slam shut the soft money loophole, the provisions of S. 3. Soft money called sewer money by many is the huge amount of contributions from corporations, unions, and wealthy individuals that are funneled through political parties to influence Federal elections.

This money is not reported. This money is not limited in the amounts. So you can have those fundraisers. The theory is that people can only give \$1,000 to a candidate. A PAC can only give \$5,000 under current law to a candidate. But you still read in the papers about these fundraisers where people are giving \$100,000 each or \$200,000 each. How do they do that? It is through the soft money sewer money loophole. They give it to all the State parties around the United States under the theory that they are giving it to parties to help local elections. Do you think when they pour in the amount of money that they are really trying to influence the election of the local county sheriff that they do not even know? Of course not. They are giving it to the State party so that they can funnel back other activities to influence Federal elections, all of that under the spending limits. It is a loophole so big you can drive a truck through it. It is a loophole in the Presidential election process as well as the congressional election process.

If this proposal had been enacted in the last election it would have drained \$85 million in soft money that we have been able to identify out of the system. We replace this corrupt practice with a grassroots system that encourages individual participation replacing the power of money with the power of the people. We set up a grassroots fund which local parties can have out in the open; wholesome, healthy. People can give to it.

People who want to support their political parties can do that. We do not weaken parties. But we say do not raise that money in the back room \$100,000 at a time. Raise it out in the open where everybody can see it, and

raise it from individual contributions and groups but raise it with limits on how much each one can give.

We also end the practice of special interest bundling. Bundling is the practice by which PAC's and lobbyists bring collection from others. The amount may greatly exceed one's contributions from an individual contribution limit. They take credit for raising the money.

So somebody can come in and say, here is \$1,000 or \$5,000, but here is \$300,000 that I gathered up for you. Here it is. That gives you a lot of influence.

This practice has forced many Members to choose on a busy day between giving access to cash cows, those who can come in and do something like that, or to hear the views of ordinary people, the teacher, the student, the construction worker, the farmer who does not have the ability to say here is \$300,000, remember me and my problem.

It is only 5 minutes to spare on a busy day. As long as you have to figure out how you are going to raise \$4 million to get reelected, or if you are from a large State, maybe \$10 million to get reelected or \$12 or \$15 million—we have had some elections where the two candidates together spent close to \$40 million in some highly contested races in big States in our country. If you have 5 minutes to spare on a busy day and you have to worry—you do not want to have to worry, but because the way the system is you have to worry about raising \$10 million for your reelection. It is a busy day. Your secretary comes in to you, says, "Senator, there is a young woman going to college, or high school in your State. She is out there and would love to come in and talk to you about Government." She is maybe wanting to go into Government herself one day. Or there is a construction worker out there. Or there is a farmer who finished wheat harvesting and came up to Washington. He got an idea while he was sitting on the tractor. He got a good idea how to help the country. He wants to share it with you.

Or there is a PAC manager out here. He can give you \$10,000 right now: One for the primary election, and one for the general election. Not only that, he can hold a fundraiser for you in Washington. We might raise \$100,000 in one night.

You have 5 minutes to spare. Who are you going to see? The young student brimming with idealism? The farmer with all the ideas while riding on his tractor? They are not going to help you raise the \$10,000 or \$20,000 or \$30,000 you have to raise this week.

No; you are probably going to see the person who can help you raise that money you desperately have to raise to finance the campaign.

Then we are shocked when we read editorials where the American people say Congress does not represent people

like us; they represent the special interests.

What a tragedy. It is a tragedy for everybody. It is a tragedy for that young woman, that student who came up and wanted to see you. It is a tragedy for that farmer. It is a tragedy for that construction worker. And it is a tragedy for you because you did not come here to conduct yourself that way. You came here because you cared about people like that young woman; you cared about people like that farmer; and you cared about people like that construction worker. You came up here to serve them, not some PAC manager.

And yet, who do you give your time to? Who do you give your 5 minutes to because you have to raise \$10 million or \$4 million?

That is wrong, Madam President. It is wrong. We know it. We know it. How long are we going to wait to cleanse this institution of that taint? How long are we going to wait to change a system that keeps us from being the men and women we came here to be, from being the public servants we came here to be? How long are we going to wait to restore the peoples' confidence in their own Government again?

We are in a critical point in our country. We all realize that, and struggle with decisions to make. We know we have to make some big decisions soon on the budget and a lot of other things. Some of the people in Congress have different ways of going about it.

We are going to get our country back on the right track, but for goodness' sake, let us have a system. Let us devote our time to thinking about that instead of thinking about raising money.

How long are we going to wait? How many more years am I going to be called upon to come out here as a sponsor of this legislation? This is the 10th anniversary; it has been 10 straight years. I started when I came out with Senator Goldwater doing this, and then with Senator BYRD, Senator MITCHELL, and Senator FORD. How many more years are we going to do it? How long are we going to wait before we do what we know we ought to do?

Are we just going to wait until the American people finally say "Enough; we are going to clean you all out"?

Even that will not solve the problem, because we still have the same corrupt system. The next bunch will start in trying to figure out how to raise the special-interest money so they can stay in office, just like the last bunch.

So we have to change it. We have to change it.

Under our bill, those kinds of choices we would not have to make anymore. We could afford to spend more time representing the people we were sent here to serve.

This bill would also discourage mud-slinging campaigns. We would improve

the quality of political campaigns by requiring accountability when negative attack ads are used. Candidates would be forced to claim responsibility for all of their ads, so they cannot hide behind plausible deniability by remaining ignorant of the contents of the ads their campaigns are producing.

We would have to come on at the end of every ad and claim credit for it with a picture on the screen, "This ad was approved by," and the name of the candidate.

That might stop ads with an anonymous announcer coming on to say: "Do you know"—the voters know—"what a scoundrel and lout this person is who is running for office?" And then that anonymous announcer goes on to say all sorts of things which are probably not true about the candidate.

No, you might not be too proud about doing that if you had to come on at the end of the ad and say, "I claim credit for this sleazy, mud-slinging campaign." Maybe you would think about thinking about it in the first place.

For the first time, real teeth would be put into the enforcement of our campaign finance laws. It does not do any good to have good, stiff rules if you do not enforce them. Currently, the Federal Election Commission, FEC, is unable to enforce the law due to its equally divided 3-to-3 political composition. We have gridlock in the Congress between Democrats and Republicans. They have it on the Federal Election Commission. They have Democrats and they have Republicans, and they have a hard time agreeing on anything when there is a hot case up. It is really shocking.

When there is a complaint against a Republican before the FEC, the Republicans usually think it is unfair and vote against doing anything, or slapping any wrist, and the Democrats vote in favor of it three times. Democrats sometimes have thought on that figure, finding fault with the FEC. This breaks the gridlock, permitting parties to take the case to Federal court if three Commissioners plus the general counsel—who is an impartial person, picked by both Democrats and Republicans on the Commission—think there should be a right to compete.

Finally, the President's plan would pay for the necessary cost of meaningful campaign finance reform by taxing lobbyists. Under the Supreme Court's interpretation in *Buckley* versus *Valeo*, we cannot mandate spending limits; they have to be voluntary. This means benefits must be given to induce candidates to accept spending caps. It only seems fitting that a plan designed to decrease special-interest influence would be paid for in this way.

The American people recognize that. A recent poll indicated that 70 percent of Americans favor a measure to pay for this kind of reform by ending the tax deduction for lobbying expenses in our bill.

So we are not asking the American people—that young woman, those students going to school, the farmer, that construction worker I talked about awhile ago—to pay more taxes in order to change the system. We are saying let us end the special deduction there is for lobbying; let us have lobbyists pay into this clean Government fund that is designed to bring more influence back to the people back home instead of those who are here seeking favors.

Madam President, this is a good reform bill. It is my hope that over the days of debate that follow, the Members of this body will listen to the facts and ignore the transparent rhetoric of those who are opposed to real change. Their broad claims will be seen for what they are, a weakly disguised attempt to defeat substantive change that would stop runaway spending and halt the destructive effects of special interests.

You have heard the facts. This bill would have taken \$85 million in soft money and tens of millions of dollars in PAC money out of the system in the 1992 election, nearly all of it away from incumbents, so that challengers would have had a more even chance to compete. This is solid reform. The numbers show it; the people understand it; and the challengers want it. But many in this body still do not get it.

If those who oppose this bill are not convinced by my arguments, I hope they will listen to the Republicans who are not currently in office. During consideration of last year's bill, 32 Republican challengers urged then President Bush to sign this bill into law. They understand it. It does not matter whether you are Democrat or Republican; if someone new is trying to break into politics, you know what it is like to be up against incumbents with huge financial warchests.

Seventeen Republican alumni, former Members of the House and Senate, also supported the bill. Further, the majority of House Republican challengers, the majority of those Republicans running for the House in 1992, 102 of 189 Republicans who were running last time, publicly supported a bill that contains spending limits and public campaign resources.

So to say that this is a partisan bill because many of the incumbents on the other side of the aisle oppose it is not true. Those people who do not have a voice here right now because they did not get here—we did not get many of them, whether Democrats or Republicans, because they could not raise as much money as those of us already here—they spoke. And the Republicans, 102 of the Republican challengers in the House, said, "Pass a bill like this."

This is not a partisan bill. It does not seek to be a partisan bill. The aim here is not to create a partisan atmosphere, but to demonstrate it should be bipar-

tisan. This is not a Democratic problem or a Republican problem; it is an American problem. I have worked hard to incorporate suggestions from both sides of the aisle. Several Senators, including Senator DANFORTH, proposed the broadcast voucher system we included. We have longer spots, not 30-second attack spots, and we have to have people assume responsibility for the ads I just described.

Many Republican Senators have targeted the cost of campaigns as a goal of true reform, and through our reduced mailing and broadcast rates, we have incorporated their concerns. In fact, it was former Senator Rudman, a Republican, who convinced me we should not allow candidates to receive the lowest unit broadcast rate; but they should be able to buy a certain amount at half that rate.

I continue to welcome suggestions of both Democrats and Republican Senators to help improve this bill.

I think that my colleagues on both sides of the aisle know that while I have been a Member of the Senate, I have not been one that would be classified as overly partisan. In fact, Madam President, I suppose, although I am handling the President's bill on the floor today on this subject, that if you went down and asked some people around the White House this morning, in light of my budget proposals yesterday, which were bipartisan, which were joined in by some Republicans, there might be some Democrats who do not think I am partisan enough sometimes.

There is not a bill designed to seek some partisan advantage. This is a fair bill. We have been meeting with several Members from across the aisle who have some legitimate concerns with this bill and want to make sure it is fair. We want to make sure that we reduce special-interest influence as much as we can. We want to make sure that we do not give an advantage, whether it is to corporations or labor unions or others, to influence the system. We are willing to work on that.

We are making great progress and I am very encouraged that, in the letter which they wrote to me, they indicated that they were not opposed to the concept of spending limits. That is very important because as long as there are those who say they want reform but no spending limits, there is really not much to talk about, as I have already said, because that is the heart of the reform. There are several Republicans who do not take that position, and I am very, very optimistic that we are going to be able to reach an agreement and that we will be able to have sufficient votes and we will have some from both sides of the aisle to pass this legislation into law.

So I extend my hand, again, to those on the other side of the aisle who want true reform, and I say to them we are willing to listen to your suggestions to

improve this bill and make it a better bill. It is our best effort. It is the President's best effort. We have worked hard on it. He has worked hard on it. But we would never claim it is perfect. That is one of the great things about the legislative process, people come in and they think about things you have not thought about yourself and other situations you may not have envisioned and they say, "We have a better idea. Let us make it a better bill."

We are open to that, Madam President. There are concerns even in our own caucus to how we can improve this bill and make it fairer. The distinguished Presiding Officer has given me some ideas how we can make this a fairer bill, and we are going to listen. We are open to suggestions. We want to make it a better bill. We want to make it fair. Above all, we want to make it a bill to open access to the political process for more people to be able to run, become a part of the political process, help us solve the problems of the country.

Madam President, sometimes within the cozy confines of this Chamber it is easy to lose sight of who we work for, and to forget what their expectations are. Let there be no mistake: the people of this country—Republicans, Democrats, Independents, people who have never voted, people who have always voted—are watching. They will, and should, hold us responsible. We can, and must, meet the challenge they have given us. We must merit their confidence once again.

I thank the Chair, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PRYOR. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PRYOR. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent I may speak as in morning business. I do not think I will be much over 5 or 6 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Arkansas is recognized.

Mr. PRYOR. I thank the Chair.

(The remarks of Mr. PRYOR pertaining to the introduction of S. 1007 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. PELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that there now be a period for morning business, with Senators permitted to speak herein.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUPPORT FOR ROBERTA ACHTENBERG

Mr. PELL. Madam President, the President has nominated Roberta Achtenberg to be Assistant Secretary for Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity. I plan to support her nomination for several reasons.

In my view, Ms. Achtenberg is qualified to hold this position. She has been a civil rights attorney, a law school dean, and an elected member of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors. She also has the endorsement of those who know her best, including Senator BOXER and Senator FEINSTEIN.

In addition, it has been a long held practice of mine to accede to the wishes of a President in selecting candidates to fill positions within the Government. I have followed this custom no matter what the political party of the President and have only departed from this practice under exceptional circumstances.

Finally, I have a personal reason for supporting this nomination. My daughter Julia is the president of the Rhode Island Alliance for Gay and Lesbian Civil Rights. I would not want to see her barred from a Government job because of her orientation. I believe we should strive to let simple standards of fairness and equal treatment be our guide in examining all nominees that come before us. I know I would want to see my daughter treated fairly if she were the nominee before us today.

Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. RIEGLE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ACCEPT AND TOLERATE DIVERSITY

Mr. RIEGLE. Madam President, I want to take note of the remarks of the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL] who is still on the floor, in terms of a moment ago indicating his support for Roberta Achtenberg to be an Assistant Secretary over at the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

I appreciate his support for the nomination, which was reported out of our committee favorably on a bipartisan basis, a majority of members of both parties, 14 to 4, based on her exceptional qualifications for this job. But I also appreciated the Senator's comments with respect to judging people on their professional qualifications and avoiding and setting aside some of what we have seen in terms of targeting individuals or targeting groups for some kind of screening out

from Government service or creating a barrier to their participating fully in our society.

I want to thank him for his comments, and I want to say that this whole country is founded with the idea in mind that we want to put an end to discrimination and intolerance against individuals and against groups in our society, whatever the basis. We have seen it practiced today in terms of racial discrimination, gender discrimination, sexual orientation, ethics discrimination many times, and there is no room for any of it in our society.

What we hold out as a vision for our country is that we can look at people on an equal footing across our society and see in people the ability to serve. The burden of citizenship, which falls on all of us in our society, is not only to participate as citizens and to vote occasionally, but also to step forward in capacities of public service. So we want all citizens to feel both the responsibility and the great privilege of being able to come forward and participate in our system of government. So all people need be welcomed and non-branded or in some way, by means of some discriminatory assignment, be told that somehow or another they are less than everyone else or unwelcome in the service of our Government.

I want to just finally say, I think the country has really had it with the intolerance. We had a big burst of that in the last Presidential campaign. In fact, the convention, I would say, of the other party featured a lot of that. There has been great commentary about it, not just from those of us in my party, but from people in the Republican Party who were deeply troubled by aspects of that national convention which seemed to be lashing out at certain people in the country and ridiculing them, branding them, and displaying a kind of intolerance toward people in terms of their attitudes or views or how they might live their personal lives in a way that I think most people in the country found highly offensive because, if you are going to start targeting individuals or groups, that practice, as the Senator now in the chair, the Senator from Illinois [Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN] said the other day, when that kind of conduct gets loose and starts moving around, many people end up getting targeted. In fact, the whole concept of our country, in effect, gets targeted if we allow that to happen.

So we cannot, I think, entertain the notion that people ought to be denied service in our Government in important capacities where they are fully equipped by professional background and training and motivation and skill to serve by virtue of some test that one or another person might apply based on their personal orientation or values. Our country was set up to accept and to tolerate diversity and to not allow

anybody, in or out of the Senate, to lay down some iron test based on their own personal views that therefore have to apply to everybody else in society. Just the reverse. We set the country up to get away from that. We do not believe in that kind of dictatorial approach from the top down where one group or one individual can somehow dictate to everybody else how they ought to live their own personal lives.

We have seen it in a lot of areas. We do not just see it with respect to this nomination in this context. It arises in this context, but we have seen it in other instances where there has been an attempt, I think, with other legislative matters to try to cut in, to have Government cut into peoples' personal lives and tell them what they can and cannot do in areas that should be reserved for personal decision. We see that with respect to, I think, a woman's right to choose and to control her own body. We have seen over a period of time efforts by some to interfere in that area as well and to sort of inject Government in and somehow impose a Government standard based on the private views of one or another individual or some other group that may have power in Government at a particular time.

I think that kind of an approach the American people, as I say, reject. I think when they saw that coming out of that national convention just a few months ago, it was very troubling and people were turned off because they do not accept that and they do not want to see that done, where we polarize, divide, and target people and by means of some arbitrary test discriminate against somebody and to somehow suggest that they are less worthy than anybody else and perhaps in this case even suggest that that is a barrier to service in Government.

It cannot be. It should not be. It is very important we understand what is at stake here on a broader plane, not just this nomination that Senator PELL from Rhode Island has addressed but to the broader issue of tolerance and equity within our society, generally.

U.S. TRADE DEFICIT

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. President, I wish to speak to an issue very much in the news. I have here a copy of yesterday's Wall Street Journal. I want to make reference to two articles that address the trade crisis that we are suffering in this country. We have a terrible trade deficit. It has been going on for many years, getting much worse this year from just last year, though last year was very bad, and we are losing millions of needed jobs in this country because of persistent patterns of difficulty including unfair trade patterns that we see in our relationships with other countries.

The other article that I wish to refer to on page A2 of the Wall Street Journal has the headline "Trade Gap Grew to \$10.21 Billion During March. Deficit Hit 4-Year High; Total Is Likely To Lower Figure for U.S. Growth."

I will ask unanimous consent that this and another article I will refer to in a minute be made a part of the RECORD at the end of my remarks and simply say that if you imagine what this article points out—that in the month of March just completed, now that the figures are in, the United States had a trade deficit in that 31-day period of over \$10 billion. That means \$10 billion net was drained out of this country and sent to foreign countries, and, of course, the jobs that are attached to that activity also were lost overseas.

It is being said now, because the trade deficit is so large, people are feeling they are going to have to revise down the first quarter growth numbers because of the damage that is being done to the American economy and the higher level of unemployment that this creates.

Half of this deficit, over half, is with Japan. Japan has a well-established pattern of what I call trade cheating, where they prevent access to our products in their market, particularly cars and auto parts, which are about half of the problem we have with Japan, but in a number of other areas as well. And as a result, great damage has been done to our economy.

Since 1980, Japan has taken over \$500 billion, over half a trillion dollars, out of the United States in terms of a trade surplus in their favor, leaving a deficit, of course, of great damage to us.

Of course, now they are saying they really cannot do anything about it. In fact, it is getting worse, not better. The March numbers are an illustration of that; over \$5 billion was drained out of this economy in 31 days and sent to Japan. It is an unconscionable pattern.

I appreciate the fact that the Clinton administration is confronting it, directly, bluntly. There was nothing done over the last 12 years of Reagan and Bush except to be very supine and make the United States into a doormat for the unfair trade practices of Japan, and it cost us, as I say, over half a trillion dollars just in net deficit to Japan since 1980.

It was not surprising to me to see that the Japanese were very quick to invite former President Reagan, after he left the White House, to come right on over to Japan and make a speech over there, for which he was very handsomely paid. The reported numbers in the newspapers were that he was paid \$2 million to go over there and give a couple of speeches—not surprising given how weak our Government was in confronting Japanese trade abuse during the years of 1980 to 1988, during the two 4-year terms of that Presidency.

I wish to cite now the second article which also relates to the trade problem. In some respects this is even more disturbing because this looks to the future where now we do not have a strategy in place such as we do with the new harder line that the administration has taken toward Japan on the trade issue.

This one deals with the proposed free-trade agreement with Mexico. There is a stunning story here on the back of the front section of the Wall Street Journal. It ought to be required reading for every person in this country who cares about the economic future and about the job base of America.

The headline is: "Mexico Mounts a Massive Lobbying Campaign To Sell North America Trade Accord in the United States."

As you read this article, there is a listing here of all of the hired guns in this town, all the lobbyists for hire, many of them former top trade officials in our Government who have been hired by the Mexican Government to do an inside job, to grease the skids, to try to put this free-trade agreement with Mexico through the House and through the Senate. It lays out in great detail what their strategy is.

They are spending countless millions of dollars doing this. They hired a former trade ambassador of our Government, if you could imagine that, a top trade official during the Reagan-Bush period has been hired by the Mexican Government as an agent for them to ram this thing through here. And it lists all of the other people—not all of them but a large number of them here in Washington—who have been hired to go and do this job for the Mexican Government.

That is why you are seeing such a propaganda barrage on this issue, because it is very carefully engineered. A lot of money is being made to pump out all the propaganda to make this thing look like it is a good deal for the United States when it is not.

I might just cite in that regard, the New York Times, which is editorializing in favor of the NAFTA, just the other day ran a 9-page advertising supplement, a paid advertising supplement by those supporting the free-trade agreement with NAFTA. It was reported—I do not know if these numbers are right, so I add that condition—it was reported that that advertising supplement cost \$475,000. That is a pretty good revenue item for the New York Times, which is a private business, a profitmaking business.

So you can see that there is a lot of money out there behind this operation. In fact, if you are selling advertisements in national newspapers, you apparently can earn a lot of money. You can sell a lot of advertising space if you are willing to go ahead and do so, as was done in that case. But it is part and parcel of this kind of a campaign that we see.

I urge people to read this because I think, when you read it, your blood pressure is going to go up, up, up.

The other day we had Ross Perot before the Senate Banking Committee to testify on the NAFTA agreement. Here he is, as a Texan businessman. You do not have to agree with each and every view he expresses, but on this issue he is exactly right. This issue is going to be a major job loser for the United States and already has been.

Just in the industry I am most familiar with, the automobile industry, Ford, Chrysler, and GM already have over 70 plants in Mexico and this free-trade agreement with Mexico is designed to make investments down there more attractive, more attractive. In fact, most of the safeguards built into this treaty are to safeguard investment in Mexico. So it is going to make it easier for companies to go down there.

As a matter of fact, the Mexican Government actually formed a fund through some Wall Street connections to create a pool of money to come in and target businesses in the United States that could be purchased, closed down, the operations moved to Mexico, where dollar-an-hour labor is available to run those operations in order to increase the profit margins, and in a period of 2 or 3 years after the move be able to sell those companies off at a much higher dollar value. It is sort of the leveraged buyout strategy of the 1990's, but it is coming in under the umbrella of this proposed free-trade agreement with Mexico.

Ross Perot came in with a well-documented study as to the terms that are being targeted in each of the 50 States that fall into this particular category. I have sent a letter to every Senator indicating the number of those kinds of companies in his or her State that are in that bull's eye, to be purchased and taken over and moved to Mexico, and the jobs that are likely to be lost in each of the 50 States as a result of it. That is just part of the problem.

So I appreciate the fact that on this issue, Mr. Perot, who is a Texas businessman, who is down there adjacent to Mexico, and I think understands this issue, has blown the whistle on it. It is a very important act of leadership, and it is one that I strongly support.

So people are going to have wake up on this issue. Despite all of this propaganda barrage that is being paid for, as this story in the Wall Street Journal points out, in the big advertising supplement, 9-page advertising supplement in the New York Times, designed to create a drumbeat that says; Oh, let us go ahead and do this. The bottom line is if you want jobs in this country, if you want jobs at a decent wage level, high value-added work that can support a family and that can carry with it the health care coverage, to enable a worker to accumulate a pension over

worklife, then these jobs have to be kept in the United States of America.

If we are not going to keep them here, then our young people and others losing their jobs, whatever age, who are out in the job market are not going to find replacement jobs. People coming out of the defense industry, where we are seeing all the cutbacks, are not going to find jobs in America. They are not finding them now.

More and more, if you read the newspapers, there are stories this week about college graduates coming out this year—there was another story in the national newspapers within the last week saying that this is the worst period of job prospect for graduates coming out of college that anybody has seen in years and years.

So what are the college graduates doing, those who have worked hard, sacrificed, their families have sacrificed so they could go ahead and get their education, many coming out with large student loans that they have to pay off, very anxious to go to work to apply the training that they have received, many of them, a very large number, cannot find any work? In fact, they are going home to be with their parents again at the very time they should be going out on their own and want to go out on their own, because there are not enough jobs.

So the question is how many more jobs do we want to send to Mexico? Should we send another million jobs to Mexico so people on Wall Street can make a fortune and so a handful of companies can fatten their profit margins and report higher earnings for the shareholders?

Somebody is going to have to be able to work in this country to provide the national standard of living. If we are ever going to close this Federal budget deficit, we are going to do it by getting people to work.

The unemployment rate in this country today is 7 percent. In Japan, it is only 2½ percent. Imagine that. And the Japanese are concerned that their unemployment rate is as high as it is at 2½ percent. They just announced that they are going to have a stimulus program, a job-building program in Japan this year of \$114 billion because they want to get more of their people to work. Bill Clinton, to his credit, asked for a jobs program for the United States of \$16.3 billion. Imagine that—\$16.3 billion versus \$114 billion that the Japanese have announced they are going to spend.

As a matter of fact, that was turned down. We had a filibuster on this side of the aisle saying no, we are not going to have any problem to stimulate jobs for summer youth and for others in the private sector. And so that bill was killed.

But here the Japanese now are going to spend \$114 billion, and over the course of a year half the money to pay

for their stimulus program is going to come out of their trade surplus with us.

So we are shipping jobs to Japan, increasing their income. They are using the money to make their economy even stronger, and we are seeing jobs disappear. And we do not even have a response in place to try to do something to try to put some job lift into our own economy.

(Mr. KERREY assumed the chair.)

Mr. RIEGLE. It is no wonder people in the country are frustrated and wonder what is going on here. But the kind of gridlock that we have seen in the past, the kind of unwillingness to face up to the problems of the erosion of the jobs base are at the heart of this problem.

So I again say this trade data for March is very alarming. It shows that the country is in real danger in this area of our national performance. The story of this back page here about all the money that the Mexican Government is spending for all the hired guns, the lobbyists here in Washington, including former trade officials out of our own Government, to ram this free trade agreement with Mexico down our throat is going to do that much more damage.

I urge my colleagues to read this. I urge the American people to take a hard look at it because it is your future that is on the line. There is a sell-out going on at the job base of America. Until we face it, and stop it, things are not going to get better in this country.

Mr. President, I have concluded my remarks. I ask unanimous consent that the articles I referred to earlier be included in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, May 20, 1993]

TRADE GAP GREW TO \$10.21 BILLION DURING MARCH

(By Lucinda Harper)

WASHINGTON.—The U.S. trade deficit deteriorated to \$10.21 billion in March, the Commerce Department said, the widest gap in nearly four years.

February's deficit was \$7.91 billion.

Although analysts said such a large trade imbalance isn't likely to repeat itself, the March numbers are likely to lower the department's estimate for total economic growth in the first quarter. The initial estimate was already a paltry 1.8 percent annual rate, but analysts said that when the government releases its first revision of the numbers next week the growth rate will probably be much closer to 1 percent.

The poor trade showing was the result of a surge in imports, which analysts say can't be sustained. Imports grew by \$4.37 billion to \$49.20 billion after falling in February. "There is no evidence that there is such a strong level of consumer demand out there," said Bruce Steinberg, senior economist for Merrill Lynch & Co. in New York. "A lot of those imports are probably sitting on retail and wholesale shelves now."

REGIONAL TRADE BALANCES

U.S. merchandise trade balances by region, in billions of U.S. dollars, not seasonally adjusted.

	Mar. 1993	Feb. 1993	Mar. 1992
Japan	-\$5.26	-\$4.13	-\$4.07
Canada	-0.64	-0.91	-0.37
Western Europe	+0.46	+1.42	+2.32
Mexico	+0.30	+0.32	+0.58
NCIS ¹	-0.97	-0.41	-0.75

¹ Newly industrialized countries: Singapore, Hong Kong, Taiwan, South Korea.

Source: Commerce Department.

Analysts supposed that last fall, when orders were being placed for spring, business leaders were more optimistic about the pending health of the economy. The big jump in imports during March was concentrated in consumer goods, excluding automobiles, and industrial materials.

Exports also grew in March at a pace, analysts said was a "blip" and wouldn't be continued because of the fundamental economic weakness of many U.S. trading partners. The U.S. sold \$39 billion of goods abroad in March, \$2.04 billion more than it did the month before, concentrated mainly in capital goods, industrial supplies and consumer goods.

"From these numbers we shouldn't think that all of a sudden there's been a great deterioration in U.S. competitiveness. In the coming months, the trade gap will move back to \$7.5 billion," Mr. Steinberg said.

The deficit with Japan and the U.S. surplus with Western Europe both worsened significantly in March. The deficit in Japan widened to \$5.26 billion from \$4.13 billion and the surplus with Western Europe narrowed to \$437 million from \$1.42 billion the month before. After Japan, the second largest trade deficit the U.S. held was with China. The Clinton administration must soon decide whether to continue providing that country with low tariffs or revoke them because of human rights violations.

When the trade figures were first released yesterday, Commerce Secretary Ronald Brown issued a statement saying that one of the ways the big trade imbalance with Japan should be corrected is by "market-driven exchange rate corrections." News of that in the markets caused the dollar to plunge against the yen in foreign exchange markets. Later, a Commerce Department spokesman said that Mr. Brown's statement wasn't a suggestion that the U.S. is developing a policy of foreign exchange manipulation. After that statement, the dollar went back up.

[From the Wall Street Journal, May 20, 1993]

MEXICO MOUNTS A MASSIVE LOBBYING CAMPAIGN TO SELL NORTH AMERICAN TRADE ACCORD IN UNITED STATES

(By Bob Davis)

WASHINGTON.—Critics of the North American Free Trade Agreement charge that under the trade accord, Mexico will snatch U.S. jobs. But Mexico has already set off a boom in at least one U.S. industry: lobbying.

Mexico is bankrolling a nationwide campaign to sell the trade accord, and Mexico, to Americans. Crafting and carrying out the campaign is an impressive lineup of political heavyweights including former U.S. Trade Representative William Brock; Toney Anaya and Jerry Apodaca, past governors of New Mexico; former Commerce Department trade chief Robert Herzstein; and retired Navy Secretary Edward Hidalgo.

According to Justice Department records, Mexico's government and business interests

have hired no fewer than 24 lobbying, public relations and law firms to negotiate and promote the trade pact, at an annual cost of about \$15 million. The campaign has been in high gear since 1991, and may run up a total tab of \$45 million by the end of this year.

IMAGE PROBLEM

Charles Lewis, executive director of the Center for Public Integrity, which tracks lobbying, says the effort may be the single biggest foreign lobbying campaign ever. "With Mexico hiring a large number of former officials," he says, "it can look like they're trying to buy the treaty."

And that's the problem. Trade pact supporters are beginning to worry that the blitz could backfire by creating the impression that the trade accord is more in Mexico's interest than in the U.S.'s. For his part, Ross Perot, a tireless adversary of the accord, recently lectured a Senate committee, "Never forget the huge lobbying effort that Mexico is making."

If the foreign lobbying, rather than the merits of the trade accord, capture the limelight, "it could be a disaster," warns Henry Freeman, who lobbies on trade issues for big U.S. companies. Meanwhile, U.S. supporters of the accord, including the Clinton administration, have been less well-organized. And U.S. opponents, led by labor unions and environmental groups, are making an impact by arguing that the pact would cost U.S. jobs and undermine environmental standards.

The accord would phase out tariffs among the U.S., Canada and Mexico over 15 years. Many economists project all three countries would gain from the accord, but Mexico should gain the most because the pact guarantees continued access to the huge U.S. market and encourages investment south of the border.

THE POWER CORRIDOR

Herman von Bertrab, an urbane Mexican businessman who runs the Mexican Embassy's operations in support of the accord, arranges to work the power corridors in Washington while at the same time building a pro-accord Hispanic bloc around the country. U.S. public relations firms help to line up speaking engagements for Mexican officials throughout the U.S., the law firms analyze specifics in the trade deal and its various side agreements, and the former government officials map the larger strategy. Congressional lobbyists work Capitol Hill.

Is Mexico overdoing it? Mr. von Bertrab doesn't think so. "We gained an understanding of how this system worked," he says. "Lobbyists are a necessary evil in the U.S."

Every Monday, Mexico's five main congressional lobbying firms meet at Mr. von Bertrab's office to divvy up work. Joseph O'Neill, a former Senate aide to Treasury Secretary Lloyd Bentsen, and Gabriel Guerra-Mondragon, who was a Clinton transition official, focus on the Democrats. The firms led by former Nixon Treasury Department aide Charis Walker and former GOP Senate aid Howard Liebengood concentrate on Republicans. To bolster links to Democrats after the election, the Mexicans just hired Christopher "Kip" O'Neill, the son of former House Speaker Thomas P. "Tip" O'Neill. Another current goal is to build contacts with the 110 new House members, many of whom campaigned against the trade accord.

The lobbyists are nothing if not persistent. In the first half of last year, for example, one Mexican lobbyist, former Rep. William Ratchford, conferred 15 times with John Scheibel, an aide to Rep. Sam Gejdenson, a

Connecticut Democrat who heads a trade subcommittee, Justice Department records show. But Mr. Ratchford is no longer lobbying on the issue. Instead, he's taken a job in the Clinton administration as lobbyist for the General Services Administration.

Indeed, Mexico has become so taken with U.S.-style lobbying that a Mexican business alliance, called Coece, paid a former U.S. trade official, Tim Bennett, to lobby Mexico's negotiators during negotiations with the U.S. on the accord. Three years before signing up with Coece, Mr. Bennett was the U.S. trade representative's chief Mexico negotiator.

Mexico has appointed four former U.S. officials as senior advisers to work out strategy: Mr. Brock, the former U.S. trade representative who also has been a U.S. senator and chairman of the Republican National Committee; Mr. Herzstein, the Commerce trade official who is now a partner in the Mexican's main law firm, Shearman & Sterling; Mr. Walker, the former Treasury aide; and Thomas Bell, a Senate aide to Mr. Brock who now is a senior official at Mexico's main public relations firm, Burson-Marsteller.

Mexican officials expect these wise men to tell them what to do about Mr. Perot's attacks on the accord and lobbyists. "Should we counterattack or just let it go?" frets one Mexican trade official. Keep cool, Mr. Brock counsels, "you can't respond to single individuals or single groups." Instead, he says, Mexico must show skeptical Americans it has "put its house in order" and is run by a "market-oriented, open-minded team of people."

To that end, Coece estimates it has treated 76 congressional aides to Mexican junkets to meet with government and business leaders. Other Mexican lobbyists have arranged tours for lawmakers and U.S. business officials. That's helped to erase Mexico's image as a "somnolent, slow-moving burrito-ville," says Mr. Bennett, the Coece lobbyist.

LACKLUSTER U.S. EFFORT

Compared with Mexico's lobbying drive, U.S. business efforts seem lackluster. Members of the Business Roundtable have raised about \$2 million and set up a group called USA-Nafta, which claims 1,300 members, many of them small and medium-size businesses, but that number overstates the group's strength. To join USA-Nafta, companies simply fill out a form; no money or effort is required. "You can't expect a gun-blazing, 50-state effort at this point," says Sandra Masur, a trade official at Eastman Kodak Co. who heads USA-Nafta.

Democratic Sen. Bill Bradley of New Jersey, a staunch supporter of the accord, recently sent out a letter on USA-Nafta stationery asking companies to "let me know that you are willing to make the accord a high priority." If a vote on the pact were held today, he warned, "We would lose."

Anatomy of a Nafta Campaign

Mexico's annual spending to negotiate and sell Nafta

Congressional lobbying	\$1,410,000
Walker/Free Assoc.	510,000
Guerra and Assoc.	360,000
Gold and Liebgood	240,000
Joseph O'Neill	300,000
O'Neill & Athey ¹	—
Trade strategy	480,000
Brock Group	360,000
Manchester Trade	120,000
Public relations, lobbying	4,160,000
Burson-Marsteller	3,260,000

Daniel J. Edelman ²	900,000
Business lobbying	720,000
COECE	350,000
SJS Advanced Strategies	240,000
Brownstein, Zeidman & Lore	70,000
Thomas J. Scanlon	60,000
Legal trade strategy	7,400,000
Shearman & Sterling	4,200,000
Cleary, Golibeb, Steen & Hamilton ³	3,200,000
Raising public support	1,450,000
Prominent Hispanics:	
Toney Anaya	260,000
Abelardo Valdez	200,000
Edward Hidalgo	160,000
Grass roots:	
Moya, Villanueva & Assoc.	270,000
Campos Communications	260,000
Apodaca, Sosa & Assoc.	170,000
Pantin Partnership	130,000
Other efforts	270,000
Solar & Ellis	220,000
Kathleen Ann Griffith	50,000
Total	15,890,000

¹No filing at Justice.

²Amount includes non-Nafta promotional work for Mexican Investment Board.

³Amount includes non-Nafta work for Mexican Finance Ministry.

Source: Justice Department records (Either contracts or payments to firms)

Meanwhile, the Mexican lobby seems pervasive. Mr. Anaya, a former New Mexico governor, who's a friend of Jesse Jackson, tries to woo unionists and environmentalists. Mr. Apodaca another former New Mexico governor, sets up seminars with Hispanic groups. Former Navy Secretary Hidalgo meets with mainstream Hispanic groups. Hispanic public relations firms in Florida, Texas and California are hired to burnish Mexico's image there. Leslie Pantin, who runs the Miami operations, says he is organizing a trip to Mexico next month for 60 Florida government and business leaders, including Gov. Lawton Chiles. Rodney Ellis, a black Texas lawmaker and former House aide, is hired to make overtures to blacks, including trips to Mexico for black leaders such as Agriculture Secretary Mike Espy.

Indeed, no opportunity for influence seems too remote for Mexico's legion of lobbyists. Kathleen Ann Griffith, a trade accord lobbyist paid to woo environmentalists, even published a pro-accord piece in the University of California's Journal of Environment and Development, with a circulation of 1,500.

Mr. RIEGLE. I think if there are no other speakers that are coming, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I know we have been discussing campaign finance

reform earlier this morning. I will make a few comments today.

I have known there has been discussion of campaign finance reform which is very, very important earlier this morning. I would like to make a few comments today and make other comments later in the next week or so.

We have been around this track so often it seems that the dust never settles. We have debated, negotiated, caajoled, and debated some more.

We have had hundreds of votes, a Presidential veto, a failed attempt at a veto override, and hours and hours of hearings.

The majority leader, Senator MITCHELL, and I even sought help from outside the Senate, appointing a six-member bipartisan panel of experts to take a fresh look at the issue. I subsequently introduced the reform bill based on the panel's recommendations.

And, now, after years of partisan haggling, we find ourselves at the starting line once again, giving new meaning to the term "running in place."

Mr. President, despite the partisan deadlock, I still have not given up hope on finding the common ground that will guarantee a Rose Garden signing ceremony.

No doubt about it; Democrats and Republicans could come together to pass a reform bill in a few days if we could only muster the political will and check our egos at the door.

Yes, I suspect some of my Democrat colleagues in the House may be silently hoping for a Republican filibuster. That may be true here in the Senate also, because some like the system the way it is, and some hope to keep it that way. They are counting on Republicans because the bill is obviously tilted against us to try to keep it that way.

Certainly it is not our intention to filibuster this bill, and may be our last only option, and the option of last resort.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle should know by now that it takes two to tango. And the Republicans will not back down from our core principles, and nor will we be bashful about our own Republican proposals for reform.

Here is what the Republican plan would do. It would ban political action committees outright; ban the practice of bundling contributions, where you can have somebody pick up a lot of collection for you, put them in a little bundle and say "Here is a campaign contribution."

We prohibit franked mass mailing during an election year. I can say that my colleague and I, Senator KASSEBAUM and I, stopped mailing out newsletters 4 or 5 years ago to our State of Kansas. Nobody objected. We saved the taxpayers hundreds of thousands of dollars by not sending out these self-

serving newsletters and other franked mass mailings. We do not send them out, election or not. There would be no mailings during an election year.

We restrict all soft money, not just party soft money. We put a premium on in-State financing by lowering the out-of-State contribution limit to \$500. We put a premium on raising money in your own States. After all, we come from different States and most people think we probably raise most of the money in those States. That is not the case. It would encourage Members to go back to their own States to raise the bulk of their money. We would put a limit on how much you could raise outside the State. In other words, we try to limit the source, by banning PAC's and limiting how much you can raise, say, if I am from Kansas, how much I can raise in New York, Illinois, or any other State.

We would also improve political competition by allowing the parties to give early seed money to viable challengers. We can do all of this without asking the taxpayers to contribute a single dime.

I am pleased to see that my Democratic colleagues have decided to follow the Republican lead with the complete ban on PAC's.

Mr. President, the administration plan is not a bargain by any measure. It will not take effect until January 1, 1995, giving incumbents a free pass in 1994.

I wonder why we are the floor. We had a hearing on Wednesday. Here it is Friday. Here is a bill that does not even take effect—it says 1995, it is really applying to the 1996 races.

Why are we here? Why are not we trying to work out some compromise? This bill should not be on the floor at all in my view. Of course the majority leader has the right to bring it up. We did not object to bringing it up. There are a lot of reasons it should not be on the floor today. It applies a different rule for the House and the Senate. For all in Congress, why do not we all have the same rules?

We are all in Congress. Why do we not all have the same rules? We should have the same rules.

It establishes inflexible spending limits that will make politics even less competitive, giving incumbents another leg up over pesky challengers.

It does not touch the millions in labor union soft money that gets pulled into the campaign finance each year, almost exclusively, about 98 percent, to Democrats.

And it raids the taxpayers' pockets again with the phony taxpayer financing scheme.

Mr. President, the American people are tired of the tax-and-spend smoke signals coming out of Washington. They want us to cut spending, cut the deficit, cut the waste in Washington, not establish a new entitlement pro-

gram for politicians. That is precisely what the Democrat bill will do.

So, Madam President, I look forward to the debate. We look forward to protecting the American taxpayers from another Washington ripoff. And if my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are up to the challenge, I look forward to trying to find the opportunity to find the magic formula that will untie the Gordian knot of campaign finance reform.

It is not just Republicans who believes this bill flunks the truth-in-advertising test. An editorial that appeared in *Roll Call* magazine had it right when it said:

President Clinton's campaign finance reform bill *** is bad legislation that should be defeated. *** The bill fails in what we believe should be its most important goal: making races more competitive. Instead, it contains significant incumbent-protection devices.

Incumbent protection disguised under the banner of reform—that is what this debate is all about.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the editorial be printed in the *RECORD* immediately after my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. DOLE. There are probably some in America who want a one-party system. And there are some editors who want a one-party system. I think of the editor of the *New York Times*, Mr. Raines. He likes a one-party system—all liberal Democrats, no conservative Democrats or no Republicans, period. That would be his ideal world. So he is beating us over the head because we will not support a plan to make it easier for Democrats to get elected. He did not get elected to anything the last time I checked. He got a lot of ink. I know you never win an argument with an editor, but we keep trying. Someone may be listening.

Then we have our good friend Al Hunt, a liberal writer for the *Wall Street Journal*. He likes the one-party system. As long as it is liberal, he does not care which party. It has to be liberal to satisfy Al Hunt. They adopt whatever the Democrats are for. Whatever the Democrats are for they are for. That is what they want. We do not have any ideas on this side, according to Mr. Hunt and Mr. Raines. We have not any reason to even debate this issue. Let the Democrats have it. We want more Democrats. We want more liberals. We want more people to raise your taxes and spend your money. That is what this so-called campaign finance reform bill is all about.

It should not be on the floor. It does not take effect for 2 years. There have to be other things we could be doing.

If we want to work out campaign finance reform, we ought to give some outside group, neither Democrat or Re-

publican, the authority to come up with a package and then require that we accept it, and we accept it. There have to be enough people out there in a big country like ours that are not so party oriented they have to be so partisan.

Let us face it. The Democrats have the majority in Congress, and they are going to write this bill to improve their chances, and I say honestly, if we had the majority, we would do the same thing. That is the way it works.

So how are we going to get real campaign finance reform? We are going to have to find some people outside the system. Maybe they are Democrats, maybe they are Republicans, but they are experts in the system and they are fair and they are objective, and they will sit down and tell us what they think ought to happen.

As I said, I think we understand this. We tried it 3 or 4 years ago. Senator MITCHELL appointed three members from the outside and I appointed three. They came up with some very good ideas. The trouble is we did not like their ideas, or some of us did not like the ideas. Some Members did not like the ideas.

So I just suggest that this is sort of a con game now. We have Democrats cheering in the cloakroom that we will kill this bill. And I know on the House side, House Democrats say "All the Republicans will kill the bill; do not worry about it. We get all the labor money, most of the business money, and all the soft money." So everybody is counting on Republicans to kill this bill and say they were for campaign finance reform which perpetuates them in power. They do not say that. But the Republicans killed it.

Well, I hope that is not the case. If this campaign finance bill should fail, then I can say on this side of the aisle we are going to be prepared again and again and again and again to try to get real campaign finance reform completed.

For those who just cannot tolerate anything but a one-party system, then they ought to be for this bill. But if they want competition, if they do not want incumbents here forever, whether Democrats or Republican, they want to give those who can challenge us the better chance, then this is not the bill to do that. This is the Incumbent Protection Act of 1993—the Incumbent Protection Act of 1993—and for the first time we are going to dip into taxpayers' pockets to pick up part of our campaign expenses.

I confess to having been part of that system. You play by the rules around here, and when I ran for President—and I think maybe someone else in this room had the same experience—I received what they call Federal matching funds. That was back in 1987. This Senator is still waiting for the FEC to complete its audit, 5½ years later, to

complete its audit. And had we been required to keep staff on board all that time, I do not know where we would have gotten the money. We did not have the money. I do not know what would have happened.

You have the Federal Election Commission, which is a big bureaucracy. They are still doing audits on the Presidential races that happened in 1987, 1988, 1991, and 1992, and there were not many Presidential candidates. If we are going to add 535 Members of Congress who get Federal funds, I am not certain how the FEC can get it done. They are going to have to have an office bigger than the Pentagon if we start public funding of all congressional races, because they cannot even complete the audits on seven, eight, or nine Presidential candidates, Republicans and Democrats.

I just hope that when we start looking at campaign reform, we will sit down together and maybe bring in someone from the outside, someone who everybody has confidence in, and try to figure out how we can do this so it does not advantage either party and, even more importantly, just incumbents at the expense of challengers.

So whatever happens in this debate—and probably what is going to happen is already a foregone conclusion—unless the Democrats, the majority party, is willing to make concessions, we cannot vote for this package, which means they cannot get cloture, which means the bill will be defeated, at least temporarily.

Let us not wait for that to happen, if in the view of this Senator there are still enough of us on both sides who will be objective enough to sit down and try to hammer out some meaningful campaign reform that is not an incumbent protection act and does not require Federal funding.

EXHIBIT 1

[From Roll Call, May 20, 1993]

EDITORIAL: A BAD BILL

While it contains a few good elements, on the whole, President Clinton's campaign finance reform bill, as it stands, is bad legislation that should be defeated.

The bill fails in what we believe should be its most important goal: making races more competitive. Instead, it contains significant incumbent-protection devices. First, it prevents challengers from outspending Members—even though Members get a big head start through franking money and other benefits of office. Second, it neutralizes the threat Members fear the most—a well-mounted independent-expenditure campaign or a rich challenger spending his or her own money. For example, if the NRA or NARAL throws \$400,000 in independent expenditures against an incumbent, the Member gets \$400,000 in free air time so he or she can counter it.

The bill also fails miserably in tackling the thorny question of where to find these public matching funds. The money will come both from a gimmicky tax checkoff and from ending the tax deductibility of lobbying expenses. This "lobby tax" is an outrageous

abridgement of the right of the public to redress grievances. It will have almost no effect on large corporations and unions, but, by effectively raising the cost of such items as association dues and even rent, it will severely limit the ability of smaller groups to get their voices heard. A well-heeled individual (Ross Perot springs to mind) will still have no trouble spending his own money to come to Washington to speak with lawmakers.

The lobby tax proceeds from the notion that lobbyists are evil, that trying to influence legislation is abhorrent. In fact, we must remain the President that our country was founded on an entirely different principle. But if lobbying is evil, then it's only logical that the executive branch should disband its own enormous lobbying apparatus: Kiss Howard Paster and his White House operation goodbye and refuse to fund legislative liaisons in every federal department and agency and the armed services. The real aim of the lobby tax is to give politicians and bureaucrats free rein to work their will without pesky steelworkers or insurance agents bothering them. The tax—not to mention the ban on lobbyists making campaign donations—is a slap in the face to anyone who believes in the First Amendment.

Congress must fund this legislation honestly: with a direct tax on all individuals. If Americans really want a system based on matching funds, they should be willing to pay for it.

What's good about the campaign bill:

Provisions to strengthen the Federal Election Commission (see page 10)—especially long-advocated in these pages—prohibiting candidates from spending any money they receive from donors who do not fully identify themselves.

Anti-bundling rules. Bundling—the practice of a group collecting checks from individuals and then presenting them to a candidate to receive, in effect, "group credit"—is a clear violation of the spirit of PAC rules. Bundling organizations should simply register as PACs and abide by PAC limits.

As bad as this campaign bill is, there's a way to pass a good one. We'll explain in Monday's editorial.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

WHITE HOUSE TRAVEL OFFICE

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, while the White House is trying to explain away President Clinton's runaway haircut in Los Angeles, it looks like the truth is being trimmed in another hair-raising controversy, this one about the White House's abrupt firing of its travel office staff.

During the past two administrations—Republican administrations—we heard a lot of pious statements on the floor of the Senate, and in the media, about conflicts of interest, perception problems, appearances of impropriety,

and sleaze. Well, as we find out more details about this breaking news story at the White House, the American people are asking questions, and they want answers to what they see as real conflicts of interest, real perception problems, real appearances of impropriety and, possibly, some real sleaze.

Yesterday, the ranking Republican on the Appropriations Subcommittee on Treasury, Postal Service and General Government, Senator KIT BOND of Missouri, sent a letter to President Clinton raising some tough questions about the firings, and asking for a copy of the travel office audit performed by Peat Marwick.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of that letter be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE,

Washington, DC, May 20, 1993.

The PRESIDENT,

The White House, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: As the ranking Republican on the Treasury, Postal Service and General Government Subcommittee on Appropriations which has jurisdiction over the White House budget, I would appreciate it very much if information concerning the recent firing of the entire White House travel office staff and selection of a Little Rock travel agency to replace it be provided to me.

Press reports indicate that on May 19, 1993 the White House summarily fired all seven employees from the travel office for "gross mismanagement". These alleged irregularities were discovered during an outside review done by the accounting firm of Peat Marwick. According to statements made by Press Secretary Dee Dee Myers while no allegations of personal misconduct are being made, "the White House held all seven responsible for the financial mismanagement".

While I certainly support your efforts to take action where mismanagement and fraud occur, I am concerned that these dismissals—occurring without any opportunity to allow the accused to defend themselves—does not seem fair. In addition, I am concerned that the audit which set these firings in motion is not available for us to review. The Washington Post reports that the reason the audit report is not available is that it is not complete, but if this is the case, I believe it is a fair question as to why were the individuals fired before the report is complete?

I would ask that the Peat Marwick review be made available to the Subcommittee as soon as possible, and would also request that salary levels, number of staff who will be taking over the responsibilities of the travel office, and the overall costs to the taxpayer of the new system also be provided. I must say I am concerned about a developing pattern of experienced public servants being fired to make room for young political appointees.

Finally, please give a detailed explanation of the decision to select a Little Rock, Arkansas travel agency to take over the White House travel duties. Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

CHRISTOPHER S. BOND.

Mr. DOLE. As it turns out, the letter from Senator BOND was ahead of the

curve, and fully anticipated the kind of disturbing information we are hearing today.

There are media reports that now suggest the firings were planned as long as 3 months ago, as part of a political coup at the nonpartisan White House travel office. It had never been done before. In a memorandum written by Catherine Cornelius, White House Assistant for Administration, David Watkins—a close friend of the President's from Arkansas—was urged to appoint Cornelius to run the travel office, replace the nonpolitical staff in the travel office with campaign staff, and establish a joint travel agency with the Democratic National Committee. All three partisan objectives were implemented earlier this week under the guise of what the White House called gross mismanagement in its travel office.

Then we were told about a Peat Marwick audit, and how it would expose all the mismanagement. Now it turns out there are questions about the audit itself. The Peat Marwick employee who supposedly conducted the audit was at the same time serving as an unpaid staff member to the Vice President's Government Review Task Force.

Mr. President, I do not know all the facts, and neither do the American people. But I do know that the White House has an obligation to get all the facts out, and get them out very quickly. At the very least, the reputations of the seven fired employees demand a fair, independent, and honest review. Next, we need to know if this audit was truly independent, was it actually ongoing before all this became public?

Unfortunately, Republicans are the minority party in both the Senate and House of Representatives—we cannot call hearings and put witnesses under oath. That has been going on in the past 12 years. If this was a Republican administration, and a so-called Republican perception problem, you can bet cameras would be setting up in the hearing room right now.

They probably would have already been there this morning and there would be hearings all week long about this terrible thing that has happened.

Well, when the Democrats have everything—the White House and the Congress—our options are fairly limited.

But I have faith in the American media. Let us get the facts. Maybe the travel staff should have been fired; maybe they should not have been fired. Maybe there was an audit; maybe there was not an audit. Maybe it was independent; maybe it was not independent.

But I urge the media to keep digging. So far, they have unearthed some interesting travel connections.

In that regard, I ask unanimous consent that a news report that just came

over Reuters' wire be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CLINTON COUSIN PROPOSED CHANGES IN WHITE HOUSE TRAVEL OFFICE
(By Gene Gibbons)

WASHINGTON.—President Clinton's cousin proposed that the White House get rid of career employees of its travel office and put her in charge long before the workers were fired for alleged mismanagement, a memo she co-wrote shows.

The White House said Friday that the memo had no connection with the firings announced Wednesday and strongly denied that the dismissals were part of an effort to fill the executive branch with Clinton relatives and campaign cronies.

It said seven longtime travel office employees were dismissed after an independent audit found "gross mismanagement" of the office, which coordinates staff travel and books planes and hotels for the White House press.

That audit, the White House said, was part of a Clinton initiative to review the performance of the federal government to try to reduce costs and improve efficiency.

Catherine Cornelius, 25, a distant cousin of Clinton, and Clarissa Cerda, who works in the White House counsel's office, made the recommendations in a Feb. 15 memo that included a chart outlining where they should be placed in the new White House structure. Copies of their memo were obtained by Reuters and CNN.

The memo also recommended that Worldwide Travel Inc., a Little Rock, Ark., travel agency, open branches in the White House and the Democratic National Committee. The agency handled much of Clinton's campaign travel last year with Cornelius as the liaison for the campaign.

This move, already taken by the White House, marks the first time that a private travel agency has been brought in to handle White House transportation. Officials said it was an interim move pending permanent competitive bidding.

The White House refused to make Cornelius available for comment.

Her boss, David Watkins, a Clinton friend from Arkansas and the White House administrator, played down the significance of her proposal.

"I did see a memo. I put it in a file and I never read it," Watkins said when asked about the document.

Watkins said he believed Cerda had given him the memo and that he told her: "This has a very low priority to me right now."

He said the memo "played absolutely no role" in the ouster of the seven career workers, who served at the pleasure of the president and have no civil service protection.

White House spokesman George Stephanopoulos said: "This memo had nothing to do with the decision. It had nothing to do—zero."

But some of the proposals made in the nine-page memo are part of—or at least similar to—the restructuring unveiled by the White House earlier this week. Cornelius and Cerda proposed:

—That they should be placed in charge as co-directors of the travel office. Cornelius has been named to coordinate White House travel operations, and Watkins said that she would probably be one of the office's three full-time employees;

—That six of the seven career employees who had worked in the White House for 10 to

30 years be replaced with Clinton campaign aides. All seven were dismissed;

—And that Worldwide Travel handle all official and political travel for the White House and the Democratic National Committee to "reduce in-house costs."

"The current operation costs more money to run than it should and could cost . . . It is decentralized and inefficient," the memo said.

"The current Travel and Telegraph Office seems to be complacent in its inefficiency and overly pro-press. Reorganization and centralization of the travel system in the White House would eliminate much of this inefficiency," it said.

In saying they should be put in charge, Cornelius and Cerda wrote that "recommended staff are more knowledgeable and familiar with the personalities involved as well as the system, thus allowing for better service."

White House officials have stopped short of accusing the seven fired employees of criminal wrongdoing, saying only that it appears some money is missing from the thousands of dollars that went through the office in arranging travel.

Spokesmen said the FBI was investigating. Of the fired employees reached by the news media, all say they are victims of a smear campaign and deny wrongdoing.

"I have not stolen anybody's money. The guys in my office have not stolen anybody's money, and I feel bad for them, because their lives have been tarnished," said Billy Dale, fired as chief of the travel office.

Clinton has distanced himself from the flap, saying all he knew was that he was told there was "no alternative" to the firings.

Mr. STEVENS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska is recognized.

Mr. STEVENS. Are we in morning business, Mr. President?

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is conducting morning business.

IN SUPPORT OF THE COMPREHENSIVE FETAL ALCOHOL SYNDROME PREVENTION ACT

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I indicated my support for the Comprehensive Fetal Alcohol Syndrome Prevention Act when the bill was introduced last week by the junior Senator from South Dakota.

Many of us here have been touched by the testimony of Michael Dorris in his book "The Broken Cord," and in particular his poignant tale of learning his adopted son was affected by the alcohol his natural mother drank during her pregnancy. Like the Senator from South Dakota, I also represent a State which has a disproportionate share of children born with fetal alcohol syndrome.

These children are often born into remote communities without the resources to deal with their medical demands, let alone educational and family resource needs.

Because of the network of data which exists in my State from the Indian Health Service in Alaska, there was some evidence of the depth of these symptoms which are classified as fetal

alcohol syndrome (FAS); however, there was little information on fetal alcohol effect (FAE), or on its prevalence in the non-Native community. That made it difficult to plan a statewide initiative to address this problem in Alaska.

Southcentral Foundation, an Alaska Native nonprofit organization in Anchorage, came to me nearly 5 years ago with a proposal designed to address a perceived need at a time when few really knew what FAS was.

As a partnership with the Indian Health Service, it was designed to intervene with a few young Native women each year, to help them remain alcohol-free for the duration of their pregnancies, and to return them to their homes with a renewed commitment to remaining alcohol-free. This included a partnership with the Alaska Native Alcohol Recovery Center, so that the baby's father could obtain treatment and education at the same time.

Ours was the first of its kind, and I thank my friend, the senior Senator from West Virginia, for seeing its merits when it was still a raw concept. He provided his support for a feasibility study, and when it proved to be feasible, for support to establish such a center.

At the same time, our State legislature appropriated matching funds so both Native and non-Native women could be served by such a center. That allowed their younger children to be with them so there were no needless barriers to treatment. This program began serving clients last year as the Dena A Coy Center, an Athabascan name meaning "future generations," or "the people's grandchildren."

This process, although arduous, taught me that projects like these can have an impact. Part of what the program brought to my States was increased visibility of the program. Alaskans began to demand more information and education about this condition and its ramifications, which has meant more than \$1 million in medical cost for each baby born with the syndrome. That is catastrophic to high FAS-rate States like Alaska, where the Indian Health Service absorbs these expenses with little visible outward sign. Most people do not even know it exists.

Recently I received an interim report prepared by a partnership between the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, the Indian Health Service, and the State of Alaska. This report provided striking information that had not previously been available. Supplemental Security Income benefits for a person diagnosed with fetal alcohol syndrome or fetal alcohol effect, for instance, are projected at \$1,750,000 over a period of 20 years. This neither addresses lifetime medical costs nor the costs to the school systems in providing specialized services for each of these babies born with FAS or FAE.

What has been more troubling to me is that these women who have given birth to an infant identified as FAS or FAE often have more than one infant with the condition. Since FAS and FAE are the most common causes of mental retardation, we have every incentive to try to save these children from conditions which are totally preventable.

Fetal alcohol syndrome has been portrayed as a Native problem, when it is much more widespread, solely because information has not been available in our State and Federal databases to show the true prevalence of the problem. In Alaska, there was literally no data on non-Native children, except anecdotal in pediatricians' medical records, until they were so identified through school-age assessment. Most of these children were identified as possibly mentally retarded, and were placed in classrooms with other developmentally delayed children.

I have met with education groups in Alaska; school board members and special education teachers began to talk about this set of behaviors for which they felt unprepared. The sheer numbers of these children in extremely small school districts were too difficult to handle, and they asked for additional resources. As I learned more about the problem, I discovered that these children had needs different from other developmentally delayed children, and that new resources were needed.

It is not enough, however, to simply devote our resources to treating or educating these children. I have long believed that prevention is the best approach. Education and public awareness serve an important role in ensuring that fewer children are born with this syndrome or effect.

The Comprehensive Fetal Alcohol Syndrome Prevention Act, which I have cosponsored, serves an important function through its four-part program, located at the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, NIH, and Substance Abuse and Mental Health Administration. This four-part program seeks to apply epidemiologic research and prevention, FAS/FAE surveillance and prevention program assessment, education and public awareness, and diagnostic criteria for fetal alcohol effect.

I think we should all thank the Senator from South Dakota for his work in this area, which I know originated from his concern for the native people of his State, as mine did with the Alaska Native people. I want to state, however, that this research cannot be the only mechanism for attacking the problem, because it will take some time to implement, and we may not have time. We face the awful possibility that we may lose an entire generation while we wait to find the best way to prevent FAS and FAE.

My message to the Senate is a simple one. We need to stimulate what I call the Mukluk telegraph. Few people know what the Mukluk telegraph is. I see the occupant of the chair smiling. It really is the concept of word-of-mouth communication in our State. Alaskan people know what the Mukluk telegraph is.

More people should be talking about what FAS is, and how important it is not drink at all while pregnant. We should talk as much as possible about how FAS babies are taking dollars that could be going into preventive medicine and public health. I urge every Alaskan, and every concerned American, to warn every young woman they know, whether pregnant or merely considering a family, that they cannot drink during pregnancy.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The following petitions and memorials were laid before the Senate and were referred or ordered to lie on the table as indicated:

POM-76. A resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Los Angeles, CA, relative to federal funding for an accelerated natural gas research, development and demonstration investment program; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

POM-77. A resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Los Angeles, CA, relative to federal funding of electric vehicle programs; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

POM-78. A resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Philadelphia, PA, relative to Ancient Forests; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

POM-79. A concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Utah; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

"H.C.R. No. 2

"Whereas upon its achieving statehood in 1896, Utah received four sections of land in every township from the federal government as trust lands for the support of the state's common schools;

"Whereas the state's obligations concerning the administration of these trust lands are governed by its Enabling Act and Constitution;

"Whereas the Enabling Act and Constitution have created a solemn compact between the United States and the State of Utah, with the state assuming trust administration responsibilities over these lands;

"Whereas in its capacity as trustee, the state has a duty of loyalty to the trust beneficiaries and an obligation to prudently manage the trust assets while seeking to maximize revenues, consistent with the balancing of short-term and long-term interests;

"Whereas while a portion of Utah's trust lands has been sold or exchanged since statehood, approximately 3.7 million acres of surface and 4.6 million acres of subsurface trust lands remain as trust assets, geographically represented by several thousand parcels of land scattered throughout the state, many of which are located within federal reserves such as national parks, military installations, wilderness study areas, and Indian reservations;

"Whereas state trust lands located within federal reserves generate little if any revenue for the trust beneficiaries and the potential for future development of those lands to generate any significant revenues is, at best, remote;

"Whereas Utah continues to have critical funding needs for its ever-expanding student population in public and higher education;

"Whereas the scattering of trust lands throughout the state has, in many instances, hindered the state in fulfilling its fiduciary responsibilities to the beneficiaries;

"Whereas the inholdings issue has been a problem the state has struggled with for many years and efforts to overcome this problem in the past have, in large part, met with little or no success;

"Whereas during the 2nd Session of the 102nd Congress the Utah Congressional delegation introduced bills in both the United States Senate and House of Representatives, collectively titled the "Utah Schools and Lands Improvement Act of 1992", designed to exchange approximately 200,000 acres of school trust lands that lie within National Parks, Indian Reservations, and National Forest Lands for equitable federal lands or interests in lands;

"Whereas the Act was written in close cooperation with the appropriate federal agencies and had the full support of the U.S. Forest Service, the Bureau of Land Management, the National Park Service, and the Office of Management and Budget as well as those affected in Utah at the state and local level, and represented a major effort on the part of all concerned interests to move forward with positive action;

"Whereas during the 2nd Session, the House of Representatives passed, HR 5118, and the Senate subsequently passed an amended version; and

"Whereas just prior to final approval of the amended changes in the legislation the Congress adjourned sine die, thereby precluding final action on the Act: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Legislature of the State of Utah, the Governor concurring therein, memorialize Congress to give its final approval through legislative action to the provisions embodied in the "Utah Federal Lands Exchange Act of 1992" during the 1st Session of the 103rd Congress to provide for the exchanges anticipated in the Act: Be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the U.S. Department of the Interior, to the U.S. Department of Agriculture, to Utah's Congressional delegation, to the leadership of the United States Senate and the United States House of Representatives, and to the President of the United States."

POM-80. A resolution adopted by the Municipal Assembly of the City of Mayaguez, Puerto Rico relative to Section 936 of the Federal Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Finance.

POM-81. A resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Iowa; to the Committee on Finance.

HOUSE RESOLUTION NO. 5

"Whereas, the production of agricultural commodities is the foundation of this state's

economy, providing food and fiber vital to the nation's welfare; and

"Whereas, the state of Iowa, one of the major agricultural states in the United States, is a leading producer of feed grains and livestock; and

"Whereas, there exists a serious problem in this state regarding the ability of nonestablished farmers to acquire agricultural land, agricultural improvements, and depreciable agricultural property required to enter farming; and

"Whereas, these conditions result in a loss in population, unemployment, and a movement of persons from rural communities to urban areas, and are accompanied by added costs to communities for creation of new public facilities and services; and

"Whereas, one major cause of this condition has been recurrent shortages of funds in private channels and the cost of borrowing money by beginning farmers assuming a large debt in order to capitalize agricultural operations, which have made the sale and purchase of agricultural land to beginning farmers a virtual impossibility in many parts of this state; and

"Whereas, studies conducted by Iowa State University indicate that only 5 percent of Iowa farmers are under age 30, that the average age of farmers is 53 years, and that nearly 40 percent of farmers are 55 years old or older; and

"Whereas, the state of Iowa has established a Beginning Farmer Loan Program which has been vital to the effort to attract more young people into farming by providing that the Iowa Agricultural Development Authority, an agency of the Iowa Department of Agriculture and Land Stewardship, may assist in cooperating with lending institutions to provide financing to beginning farmers for the acquisition of agricultural land, improvements, and agricultural property; and

"Whereas, since the establishment of the program, the number of loans by the Iowa Agricultural Development Authority has steadily increased from seven loans in 1981 to a record 287 loans in 1991; and

"Whereas, since 1981, the Authority has made 1,385 loans on approximately 120,000 acres of land, and other agricultural projects amounting to \$120,073,028 in loans with no obligation by the state or federal government to guarantee payment of the loans in case of default; and

"Whereas, the Beginning Farmer Loan Program is supported by small issue private activity bonds ("Aggie Bonds") which are exempt from federal income tax; and

"Whereas, the United States Congress has expressed support for the Iowa Beginning Farmer Loan Program by continually extending the expiration of the federal tax exemption vital to the future of the program; and

"Whereas, legislation enacted in 1992 by the Congress of the United States which included provisions extending the effectiveness of the exemption was vetoed because of unrelated provisions contained in the legislation; and

"Whereas, since July 1, 1992, the Iowa Agricultural Development Authority has been prohibited from closing 138 new loan applications for beginning farmers totaling \$16,645,346, desperately needed in order to continue this successful program vital to ensure the transition to a new generation of farmers; and

"Whereas, in order to support the program as a dependable source of low-income financing for beginning farmers it is essential to

provide for the efficient administration of the program through stability and continuity in federal law; and

"Whereas, the immediate passage and enactment of legislation by the United States Congress and the President of the United States to support the Iowa Beginning Farmer Program is unanimously supported by the Agriculture Committee of the Iowa House of Representatives, including the Honorable Representative Russell J. Eddie, Chairperson; the Honorable Representative James A. Meyer, Vice Chairperson; the Honorable Representative Daniel P. Fogarty, Ranking Member; the Honorable Representative Bill Bernau; the Honorable Representative Clifford Branstad; the Honorable Representative Barry Brauns; the Honorable Representative Dwight Dinkla; the Honorable Representative John Greig; the Honorable Representative Sandra H. Greiner; the Honorable Representative James Hahn; the Honorable Representative Mark Henderson; the Honorable Representative Hubert Houser; the Honorable Representative Ralph Klemme; the Honorable Representative Deo Koenigs; the Honorable Representative Dennis May; the Honorable Representative Dolores M.e Mertz; the Honorable Representative Norman Mundie; the Honorable Representative David Osterberg; the Honorable Representative Richard Vande Hoef; the Honorable Representative Keith Weigel; and the Honorable Representative Jerry Welter: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives, That the Congress of the United States enact with all possible urgency legislation permanently extending the effectiveness of the exemption from federal taxation of the small issue private activity bonds used to support loans made to beginning farmers under Iowa's Beginning Farmer Loan Program; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be submitted by the Chief Clerk of the House to the Honorable Terry E. Branstad, Governor; the Honorable Dale M. Cochran, Secretary of Agriculture; and Mr. William Greiner, Executive Director of the Iowa Agricultural Development Authority; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be submitted by the Chief Clerk of the House to the Honorable William J. Clinton, President of the United States; the Honorable Albert Gore, Jr., President of the United States Senate; the Honorable Thomas S. Foley, Speaker of the United States House of Representatives; the Honorable Senator George J. Mitchell, Senate Majority Leader; the Honorable Senator Robert Dole, Senate Minority Leader; the Honorable Congressman Richard A. Gephardt, House Majority Leader; the Honorable Congressman Robert H. Michel, House Republican Leader; the Honorable Senator Daniel Patrick Moynihan, Chairman, Senate Finance Committee; the Honorable Congressman Dan Rostenkowski, Chairman, House of Representatives Committee on Ways and Means; and Iowa's congressional delegation."

POM-82. A concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Utah; to the Committee on Finance.

H.J.R. No. 5

"Whereas section 1014(b)(6) of the Internal Revenue Code provides a tax benefit for citizens of community property states that common law states do not receive;

"Whereas in community property states, the tax basis on property received from a decedent is determined by applying a stepped-up basis to the entire community interest;

"Whereas in common law states, the tax basis is determined by applying the stepped-basis only to the portion of the property actually received;

"Whereas this inequity between community property and common law states can be removed by amending Section 1014(b)(6) to extend the tax benefit currently enjoyed by community property states to common law states; and

"Whereas any tax benefit as significant and basic as that derived from the treatment of the property of decedents should be equally applied to all Americans regardless of where they live: Now, therefore,

Be it *Resolved*, That the Legislature of the state of Utah urge the United States Congress to amend Section 1014(b)(6) of the Internal Revenue Code to provide that the current determination of tax basis on the property of decedents that is applied in community property states be extended to common law states to ensure tax equity for all Americans: Be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the majority and minority leadership of both houses of the United States Congress and Utah's congressional delegation."

POM-83. A resolution adopted by the Legislature of Rockland County, NY, relative to Northeast Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

POM-84. A resolution adopted by the Municipal Council of the City of Plainfield, NJ, relative to Bosnia-Herzegovina; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second time by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. PRYOR (for himself, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. DOLE, Mr. WOFFORD, Mr. COHEN, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. DANFORTH, Mr. WELLSTONE, Mr. SARBANES, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. DORGAN, Mr. CONRAD, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. INOUE, Mr. REID, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. FEINGOLD, Mr. GLENN, Mr. DURENBERGER, Mr. KRUEGER, Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN, Mr. PELL, and Mrs. FEINSTEIN):

S. 1007. A bill to recreate the common good by supporting programs that enable adults to share their experience and skills with elementary and secondary school age children; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

By Mr. BAUCUS (for himself and Mr. CHAFFEE):

S. 1008. A bill to conduct a comprehensive assessment of the Nation's biological resources; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. MITCHELL (for himself and Mr. DOLE):

S. Res. 111. A resolution to authorize the Senate Ethics Study Commission; considered and agreed to

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. PRYOR (for himself, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. DOLE, Mr. WOFFORD, Mr. COHEN, Mr. ROCKEFELLER,

Mr. DANFORTH, Mr. WELLSTONE, Mr. SARBANES, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. DORGAN, Mr. CONRAD, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. INOUE, Mr. REID, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. FEINGOLD, Mr. GLENN, Mr. DURENBERGER, Mr. KRUEGER, Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN, Mr. PELL, and Mrs. FEINSTEIN):

S. 1007. A bill to recreate the common good by supporting programs that enable adults to share their experience and skills with elementary and secondary school age children; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

NATIONAL MENTOR CORPS ACT OF 1993

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. President, today is an important day for me. I am introducing legislation to establish the National Mentor Corps. It's the day we ask Congress to make age-to-age mentoring a national priority. It's the day we remember, as a country, that no one makes it all alone.

Growing up has always been hard. Growing up in America today is especially hard. Today's children are less likely to finish high school, and more likely to get pregnant, die violently, or be arrested for violent crimes.

A recent report says 45 percent of children born into new families are at risk: That means the mother has not finished high school, is not married, or is a teenager. Simply put, Mr. President, America's children need our help.

That's why I'm here to talk about a new way to help. Intergenerational mentoring is the helping hand the older generation extends to the younger generation to guide children into maturity. Our young people simply aren't getting enough day-to-day guidance and caring from us.

Today's working parents are overwhelmed by too little time and too many responsibilities. Grandparents don't live down the block, they live in different States. At schools, staffs are being cut back and teachers are too busy to provide one-on-one attention. Standing over a fryer at McDonald's has replaced job apprenticeships.

The answer is quite simple and natural. Our aging population is the fastest-growing group in America today. Older people want to stay active and involved. Statistics say that 13 million Americans over age 60 are already volunteers and that 14 million more are willing and able to volunteer. So often we talk only about the special needs of older Americans. We sometimes forget the many good things that older Americans have to offer.

For all these reasons, Mr. President, I am introducing the National Mentor Corps Act of 1993—a public-private partnership that will provide a mentor-rich environment in our public school system from kindergarten through high school. The National Mentor Corps would place trained mature adults into the public schools, matching the needs of the young with the talents of seniors.

The National Mentor Corps needs no new funds. This year the Elementary and Secondary Education Act [ESEA] is scheduled for reauthorization. The

legislation I am proposing allows for intergenerational mentoring programs to be funded under chapter 2 of the act, "Federal, State, and Local Partnership for Educational Improvement." This legislation is designed to complement all other senior service programs. It is my hope that this legislation will be incorporated into the ESEA reauthorization package which will be considered by the Labor and Human Resources Committee during the 103d Congress.

In addition, the National Mentor Corps Act of 1993 directs the Secretary of Education to develop a National Resource Center for Intergenerational Mentoring to serve as a central source of information and assistance on intergenerational mentoring. This provision, however, will be handled separately from the changes proposed for the ESEA and is not a request for a separate authorization.

There are some excellent mentoring programs already scattered throughout the country. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this information about several mentoring groups be printed in the RECORD following my remarks. We cannot improve on these programs and others out there. We can, however, provide the Federal infrastructure that will allow this blossoming mentoring movement to flourish. The National Mentor Corps Act of 1993 will allow established programs to expand and become a permanent part of the American educational landscape.

I am pleased to say that the National Mentor Corps Act of 1993 has the support of AARP, Families USA, Generations United, the National Caucus and Center on Black Aged, the National Association of Foster Grandparents program directors, the National Association of Retired Senior Volunteer Program directors, family friends, the National Council on the Aging, the National Association of Elementary School Principals, the American Association of School Administrators, and the Children's Defense Fund.

I am especially pleased to be joined today in introducing the National Mentor Corps Act by several of our distinguished colleagues: Senator LEVIN, who was an early advocate of intergenerational mentoring, as well as Senator DOLE, Senator DANFORTH, Senator WOFFORD, Senator ROCKEFELLER, Senator SARBANES, Senator MURRAY, Senator DORGAN, Senator CONRAD, Senator INOUE, Senator REID, Senator LEAHY, Senator FEINGOLD, Senator GLENN, Senator KRUEGER, Senator WELLSTONE, Senator DURENBERGER, Senator PELL, Senator MOSELEY-BRAUN, and Senator FEINSTEIN.

Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to support the National Mentor Corps Act of 1993. I strongly believe that this legislation will provide the foundation for America's entry into the 21st century.

There being no objection, the material mentioned earlier was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BOSTON PARTNERS IN EDUCATION, INC.,

Boston, MA.

Boston Partners in Education (BPE) is a nonprofit multicultural agency dedicated to supporting the academic growth and social development of public school children. Linking a wide variety of community resources to schools, BPE provides programs and services to teachers, students, administrators, and parents.

BPE plays an active role on the board of the National Association of Partners in Education, was a founder of the Massachusetts Association of Partners in Education, and provides leadership in national and international educational initiatives.

Enabled by a grant from the Edna McConnell Clark Foundation, BPE pioneered in intergenerational programming over 15 years ago.

Today, older adults are involved in BPE's services to Boston Public schoolchildren as:

Special math/science mentors in initiatives funded by the National Science Foundation and the U.S. Department of Education;

"Listener mentors"—specially trained to work with academically and socially at-risk children in the primary grades;

Guest "readers aloud" in preschools, kindergartens and grade schools;

Tutors in all academic subjects, math, science, language arts, social studies, history, and foreign languages; and

"Oral historians" in specially designed workshop series in which youngsters and elderly persons examine their own and others' proud cultural traditions.

Each year, dozens of such Intergenerational Exchanges are coordinated by Boston Partners in Education's Intergenerational Director, Eleanor Swartz.

[Los Angeles Unified School District, May 18, 1993]

DOVES—DEDICATED OLDER VOLUNTEERS IN EDUCATIONAL SERVICES

What: D.O.V.E.S. is a special project of the Los Angeles Unified School District School Volunteer Programs Section. Its purpose is to recruit, train and place senior citizen volunteers in district schools.

The project is funded by the District and the Friends of the School Volunteers Program of Los Angeles. It is an outgrowth of the Grandparents Program pioneered in 1971.

Who: The program provides the schools with carefully selected and trained senior citizens to supplement the work of classroom teachers.

Why: D.O.V.E.S. is designed to meet the need of our older citizens to be valued as the asset they are. Additionally, the program meets the needs of our students for individual attention and gives them the opportunity to interact with the older generation.

How: The program develops cooperative relationships with:

The Schools: By establishing the needs of individual schools and students and planning with the principal or volunteer coordinator for the training and orientation of adult volunteers.

The Community: By seeking recruits among retirees and pre-retirees from business, industry, labor and the professions. A special effort is made to contact religious institutions, senior citizen centers and recreation centers.

The Media: By working with newspapers, radio, television and special interest publications in publicizing the human interest stories to be found in the successful matching of volunteer skills with student and school needs.

DOVES assist with: Carpentry, Typing, Field Trips, Library, Music, Swimming, Gardening, Enrichment, Playground, Public Speaking, Dancing, Cooking, Science, Homework, Displays, Special Events, Math, Sewing, Arts, Crafts, Sports, Tutoring, Reading Stories, Nursing Assistance, Career Guidance, Vocational and Technical Skills.

INTERGENERATIONAL MENTOR PROGRAMS CONDUCTED BY GENERATIONS TOGETHER, AN INTERGENERATIONAL STUDIES PROGRAM, UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH

Generations Together, an Intergenerational Studies Program of the University of Pittsburgh's Center of Social and Urban Research, has a 14 year history of intergenerational program development and study. Generations Together fosters a variety of program models that bring the young and old together in experiences that promote understanding and support the growth and learning of both generations.

Since 1985, Generations Together has conducted a range of intergenerational mentor programs in pre-school, elementary school, secondary school and university settings in Pittsburgh and western Allegheny County. These models and their main goals are as follows:

Pre-school mentor programs are designed to provide support for families recruited from local Head Start programs. Older volunteers visit the families in their homes once a week to perform literacy-related activities with the children. The mentors also help the parents understand the importance of family literacy to their children's education.

Elementary school mentor programs aim to reduce the probability of drug use by improving basic academic skills and promoting the development of social skills and enhanced self-esteem. Each student is paired with an older volunteer for one-on-one tutoring, and participates in group activities which provide cultural enrichment and foster positive peer interaction.

High school mentor programs are designed to improve student academic performance, provide career exposure, and promote social skill development. Mentors work with students across the spectrum, including at-risk and high achieving students, minority students involved in programs emphasizing science and math, and students with a special interest in the arts.

University mentor programs provide academic support, career guidance, and social support to university students. The roles of mentors at the University of Pittsburgh are diverse: they tutor, read student theses and dissertations, coach oral presentations, serve as guest lecturers, coordinate professional seminars, assist in laboratories, conduct practice interviews, help to develop job placements, and enhance language proficiency of international students. In a special University program with the School of Engineering, retired engineers enrich the curriculum by preparing case-studies drawn from engineering practice and coach students in problem-solving curricular activities.

An estimated 200 older adult mentors have worked with approximately 1000 children and youth in the Generations Together mentoring programs since 1985.

Children, youth, and young adults who work with these mentors evidence measurable change in their academic performance, motivation to learn, realization of academic goals, and their self esteem. Older adults who mentor in these programs represent a

diverse population from within and outside the community in which they are mentoring. They bring a variety of skills that reflect backgrounds as varied as homemakers with no for-pay work experience to retired blue collar workers, university professors, and business executives.

The volunteers report a high degree of satisfaction as they recognize student progress, develop meaningful friendships with students, and utilize their professional and life skills. These volunteers feel as though they are making a valuable contribution to the education of children and youth, the future workers and decision makers of our society.

[Gulf Coast Jewish Family & Mental Health Services, Inc., Clearwater, FL]

INTERGENERATIONAL PROGRAMMING

(Michael Bornstein, President and CEO)

Gulf Coast Jewish Family and Mental Health Services, Inc. (GCJFMHS) is a nonprofit, non-sectarian human services agency serving the West Central region of Florida, including the Tampa, Clearwater and St. Petersburg communities. Established in 1960, the agency offers a wide array of innovative and cost-effective programs designed to help children, adults, seniors and families with serious emotional, physical, personal and financial needs.

GCJFMHS provides three intergenerational mentoring programs, offering at-risk children the support of an older volunteer through one-to-one matching. Ongoing outcome evaluation measures program effectiveness through pre and post-testing using a variety of standardized self-esteem and behavioral measures as well as informal measures such as school attendance and grades.

1. Adopt-a-Grandchild program was initiated in 1980 through local funding provided by the Juvenile Welfare Board of Pinellas County, a local taxing district for children's services. Children matched are typically from low income, single parent families and range in age from infancy to 16. The children very often have behavioral problems, poor school performance and low self-esteem.

When a match is made, the senior volunteer participates in an orientation program, the volunteer as well as the child are made aware of program goals and expectations. The senior volunteer and child typically spend a few hours each week engaged in a range of assorted activities, usually social in nature. The program's supervisor makes regular contact with the volunteer and child to assure that the match is going well.

2. Project Growing Together matches senior volunteers with children ages three through 11 who are under the supervision of state protective services, in shelter care or in foster care. Funded by the State of Florida beginning in 1989, the program focuses on establishing a non-threatening relationship between the generations which will help alleviate some of the stress of separation and placement felt by the children. Senior volunteers typically spend two to four hours a week of quality time with their children providing a positive, stable influence in their lives.

3. Linking Lifetimes matches senior mentors with middle school referred children who have been identified as being at-risk of delinquency, truancy or dropping out of school. Like Gulf Coast's other intergenerational programs, senior volunteers are encouraged to develop personal relationships with their children and participate in a variety of informal activities. This program was initiated in 1989 as one of 10 na-

tionwide projects funded by the Mott Foundation and coordinated by Temple University.

INTERAGES

[Montgomery County Intergenerational Resources Center, Kensington, MD]

INTERGENERATIONAL BRIDGES PROJECT SUMMARY

The Intergenerational Bridges Project, sponsored by Interages, a non-profit organization in Montgomery County, Maryland, has recruited, trained and placed 51 senior adult volunteer mentors with 60 proteges at two schools in East Silver Spring, MD. during the past three years. These youths, ranging in age from 10 to 14 years, come from a growing community of disadvantaged immigrant populations. With the lowest median income in the county, the community suffers from a heavy concentration of drug and other criminal activity. This environment places young, recently arrived immigrant children, often illiterate in their native language, unable to speak English, and from families under extreme stress, at high risk of failing in school, dropping out and becoming vulnerable to the drug culture.

The mentors, a highly skilled and energetic group of seniors (over age 55), have devoted over 2100 hours of their time during the past year alone to serving their proteges for one hour each week offering guidance, moral support and assistance in building academic and social skills, while at the same time helping them to improve their English and communication skills. In addition, mentors accompany their youths on several field trips each year to destinations such as the Smithsonian Museums and the Kennedy Center. The opportunity for young proteges to benefit from a field trip when each has a personal adult companion can not be overstated.

In addition to the project's planned activities, which also include an international dinner for families of proteges, giving them an opportunity to learn about the program and meet their child's new friend, many mentors spend individual time with their proteges during vacations and on week-ends. Mentors have treated their proteges to birthday lunches at a special restaurant at the mall, to a walk through Brookside Gardens—even to a visit of a joint session of Congress, followed by pizza at Union Station!

While a quantitative analysis of changes in student achievement and/or behavior remains elusive, the continued overwhelmingly positive response to Bridges from teachers and administrative staff, from school officials, from county agencies, from other groups attempting similar projects, and from participants themselves, leads us to conclude that this project is making a difference in the lives of children who have few opportunities to interact on a one to one basis with American born (or fully acculturated foreign born) adults in a non-threatening environment. An unanticipated positive outcome of the project has been the education of the mentors and accompanying increased sensitivity to the issues of growing education gaps and poverty experienced by the newest members of our community.

The Intergenerational Bridges Project has been featured in *Modern Maturity*, *USA Today*, and was awarded the "Highest Achievement Award" by the Montgomery County Community Partnership and the Volunteer Center in 1992. In addition, Interages has been invited to present Bridges at three national conferences.

MENTORS INC. FACTSHEET

INTRODUCTION

A role model, advisor and friend is a crucial motivator in the life of a young person. Our goal is to provide a mentor to each District of Columbia public high school student who has the potential and the will to graduate from high school and form concrete plans for either college, vocational school or the military.

Mentors are matched with students on a one-to-one basis, and they provide practical advice, guidance and encouragement from the sophomore year through graduation. The mentors are volunteers 21 or older who are stable in their professional and personal lives.

In 1987, the first year of Mentors Inc., one hundred students participated in the program. That number has grown steadily each year, and in 1992-93 there are 500 mentor-student pairs. The program operates in every comprehensive high school in D.C.

Mentors Inc. is supported by the D.C. Public Schools and by grants and gifts from corporations, foundations, universities, and individuals. Through funding, individual mentor participation and special projects, this program merges the assets of the academic community, business community, and the D.C. Public Schools.

WHAT MENTORS DO

Help students identify specific short and long-term goals;

Work with students to set and keep a schedule for school and work activities;

Help students develop study and test-taking skills;

Strengthen students' business communication and job skills;

Assist students while they make post-high school plans;

Visit students at school; have students visit work sites;

Open academic and career opportunities for students; and

Participate in culture, recreation and entertainment.

WHO THE STUDENTS ARE

Any student attending one of the 12 comprehensive D.C. public high schools may sign up with Mentors Inc.

Students in the Mentor Program run the academic spectrum, from high academic achievers to those who need extra help to finish school.

Students must be in regular attendance at school. We prefer that students have at least a C- grade point average.

Mentors Inc. also provides: College scholarships, individual college counseling, campus visits and college fairs, SAT preparation classes, free dental care, summer job placement, academic tutoring, student emergency fund, career counseling, and free psychotherapy.

NEW YORK STATE DECADE OF THE CHILD MENTORING PROGRAM

Introduction: "If every 'at-risk' student had an in-school mentor who really cared, that one act could cut the dropout rate in half."—Dr. Ernest Boyer, President, Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Studies show that the presence of a strong adult role model has an extremely positive influence on a child's development. In the 1950's, 11% of all children went home to an empty house. Today, 65% of our children find empty homes when they return from school. The average daily time spent in one-to-one interaction between parent and child is 15

minutes. In a recent national study, one million children—29% of those entering the first year of high school dropout of school before graduation. One out of five Americans age 16 or older is functionally illiterate.

The Program: The New York State Mentoring Program, founded and chaired by Matilda R. Cuomo in 1987, is a school-based, state-wide, effective early-intervention program to help children in grades K-8 improve their self-esteem, broaden their vision of opportunities and apply themselves in school. The NYSMP matches caring adult volunteers on a one-to-one basis with a mentee.

Mentoring is a one-to-one relationship between a volunteer adult role model and a child. This unique relationship provides support and encouragement and can help a child develop the academic and social skills necessary to succeed in the workplace of the 21st century. Leon Martel, Sr. V.P. of the Conference Board, recently observed that many U.S. companies have made education a top priority of their volunteer efforts because of its obvious relationship to improving the nation's workforce. (Education Week, April 28, 1993.)

Working cooperatively with teachers, corporations, parents, and children the NYSMP links the school, the home and the community together to strengthen programs for children. "Millions of America's children are in trouble. To succeed in school and in life, they need one-on-one adult support and guidance. Providing that support is a job not only for schools, but for the entire community. The New York State Mentoring Program is making it happen." Keith Geiger, President, National Education Association.

In the spring of 1993, there were over 2,000 children in 152 school-based programs in 33 of New York's counties who had mentors recruited and trained by the New York State Mentoring Program. In New York City there were nearly 600 children matched with individual mentors.

The New York State Mentoring Program is based on public/private partnerships and part of Governor Cuomo's innovative Decade of the Child initiative. Groups of mentors from 119 organizations become partners with NYSMP. Partners include 48 corporations, 71 state, city and federal government entities, professional and community organizations, colleges and secondary schools. Richard A. Jalkut, CEO, NY Telephone states that, "New York Telephone is proud of its association with the New York State Mentoring Program. By providing young people with role models, encouraging them to stay in school, and by stressing the importance of education, New York State Mentoring is making an invaluable investment in New York's children—the future of our state."

The NYSMP has received widespread support from business, schools and the community. The Ford Foundation has given NYSMP a grant for the design and implementation of an effective method of program evaluation. Other states, including Colorado and New Jersey, have expressed interest in establishing mentoring programs modeled after the NYSMP as well as Milan, Italy.

THE NEW YORK CITY SCHOOL VOLUNTEER PROGRAM, INC. (SVP)

Mission: To help New York City public school students gain the educational skills and self-esteem they need to become successful learners and productive community members, by providing them with individualized instructional support from a corps of well trained volunteers.

History: Founded in 1956 as the first School Volunteer Program in the country. Catalyst for the National School Volunteer Program/National Association of Partners in Education, Incorporated in 1970 as a not-for-profit corporation under Section 501(c)(3).

Scope: 1991-92. 83,713 students/586 schools/6,945 volunteers/508,548 hours/\$25 cost per student.

Programs: Core Programs—Trained volunteers tutor students in elementary or junior high school for a minimum of two hours a week at a school near their home or work. Subject include math, reading, writing and English as a second language.

Project Home Stretch: Empowering Teens at Risk to Finish High School—Trained volunteers work with at-risk students in daytime and evening high school programs. Volunteers help students master the high school curriculum, provide role models from the professional world of work and assist with college decision-making and financial aid applications.

Authors Read Aloud—Children's authors introduce elementary school students to the creative writing process and increase their enjoyment of reading through repeated classroom visits.

Cultural Resources—Trained volunteers introduce elementary school students to our city's major museums and provide preparatory and follow-up experiences in the classroom for each museum visit.

Literary Leaders—Trained volunteers discuss works of literature with small groups of students ready for additional challenges. Children learn to read critically, think independently and express themselves clearly.

Training: For tutoring elementary-age students; 10 hours spread over four classes held during the day. For tutoring high school students; 8 hours spread over three classes held during the day or evening. Held at the SVP, 443 Park Avenue South (30-31 St.), NYC.

Place and Time of Tutoring: At a school site located near home or work; during the day (all ages) or in the evening or on weekends (high school-age). A minimum of two hours per week is required.

THE OASIS INSTITUTE

Established in St. Louis in 1982, OASIS received initial support from the United States Department of Health and Human Services' Administration on Aging. Since then, the organization has grown rapidly—both in numbers of centers and in its national membership. Today, serving more than 175,000 members in 22 cities, OASIS is widely recognized as a successful model for productive aging and is supported by a consortium of public and private sponsors. OASIS receives major national support from The May Department Stores Company and local support from corporations, hospitals, service agencies, universities and cultural organizations.

One of OASIS' most far-reaching volunteer opportunities is the Intergenerational Tutoring Program. The program addresses the problem of illiteracy with an approach designed to build children's self-esteem and positive attitudes toward learning while strengthening reading skills. Working with elementary schools, OASIS matches trained older adult volunteers with young children who are having difficulty learning to read. The volunteers work one-on-one with the children each week throughout the school year as their tutors, mentors and friends. The program has proven to be beneficial to both the students and the tutors, strengthening ties between generations in our country. OASIS Intergenerational Tutoring is unique

in its specific focus on building reading skills of 5-9 year old children, its specially designed curriculum and training program for tutors, and its ongoing support plan for the tutors and school staff. The program is evaluated annually by principals, teachers and tutors, and the responses are overwhelmingly positive.

The OASIS Intergenerational Tutoring Program began as a pilot in St. Louis and Denver in 1989 and as of May 1993 operates in 12 cities: Akron, Denver, Escondido, Hyattsville, MD, Indianapolis, Los Angeles, Phoenix, Portland, Rochester, NY, St. Louis, San Diego and Tucson. The program will begin in Cleveland and San Antonio in the 1993-94 school year. Over 1400 tutors currently work with more than 2,200 children in 26 school districts across the United States.

TEMPLE UNIVERSITY'S CENTER FOR INTERGENERATIONAL LEARNING

Temple University's Center for Intergenerational Learning sponsors three intergenerational mentoring programs: (1) Linking Lifetimes, a national multi-site research and demonstration initiative which targets at-risk middle school students and young offenders; (2) Across Ages, a 5 year school-based intergenerational drug prevention program; and (3) SCANTAP, a collaborative effort between the Center and SCAN (Supportive Child Adult Network) which focuses on supporting drug-involved families. All of these programs recruit and train older adults focuses on supporting drug-involved families. All of these programs recruit and train older adults (55+) to serve as mentors. The mentors are integrated into comprehensive school and/or agency-based interventions in order to maximize the impact on youth.

Linking Lifetime—Created in 1980, Linking Lifetimes is currently operating in schools, juvenile justice programs, and youth service agencies in the following cities: Memphis, TN; St. Petersburg, FL; Miami, FL; Los Angeles, CA; Detroit, MI; Portland, OR; Washington, DC; Springfield, MA; and Syracuse, NY. It has been funded by the Florence V. Burden, Edna McConnell Clark, H.W. Durham, Ittleson, and Charles Stewart Mott Foundations, the Exxon Corporation, and a variety of local foundations. Over the past 3 years, 479 relationships were formed through this program. Mentors are culturally diverse and have varied educational and socio-economic backgrounds. At each site, mentors are required to meet with youth at least 2 hours/week for a minimum of a year. An 8-10 hour mentor pre-service training and monthly in-service meeting are key elements of the program. Mentors help youth set specific goals that guide them through school, work, and life decisions.

A study by Public Private Ventures and an evaluation by Lodestar Management/Research and the Academy for Educational Development/National Institute for Work and Learning have yielded valuable information about effective program practices, the nature of the mentoring relationship, and the impact of mentoring on youth and older adults. An intensive follow-up study indicates that 80% of the youth improved their personal and behavioral skills as a result of having had a mentor. Over 75% of the youth interviewed said they could "stick with school better" because they had a mentor; 94% expressed a gain in self-confidence. A comprehensive program development manual, a recruitment video, and a mentor training video and Facilitator's Guide are available from the Center for Intergenerational Learning.

Across Ages—Across Ages, a five-year intergenerational drug prevention project funded by the Center for Substance Abuse Prevention, is now in its third year. Approximately 180 at-risk 6th grade students have been matched with older adults. In addition, students are involved in community service activities and participate in a life skills program to enhance their problem solving skills and promote social competence. Parent workshops are also part of the overall program design. Across Ages is based in three Philadelphia middle schools in Philadelphia.

Across Ages mentors are involved in school-based programs as well as activities after school and during the summer. Through ongoing training, mentors learn strategies for promoting social competence and enhancing youth's ability to resist alcohol and drugs. Early evaluation results indicate that students who have mentors show significant positive changes in their self-esteem, feelings of well-being, and attitudes toward school and older people. Improvement in school attendance and a reduction in negative behavior are also indicated.

SCANTAP (Substance and Child Abuse Networking, Treatment and Prevention) is a comprehensive prevention and intervention program for substance abusers and their families. As one component of the program, elder mentors offer a wide range of assistance to substance abusing families in many areas including social and emotional support, information sharing and advocacy, education encouragement, career development, cultural and recreational activity, and parenting skills. Mentors work with these families on short and long term goals that augment identified case management plans. Mentor assistance includes making home visits with the case management team, modeling appropriate parenting skills, serving on the multi-disciplinary team of their family, and providing respite for families on a limited scale.

In addition to these model intergenerational mentoring initiatives, the Center received funding from the Retirement Research Foundation and the Administration on Aging to provide technical assistance to the National Urban League and Boys and Girls Clubs of America to help their local affiliates integrate intergenerational mentoring and community service into their overall programs.

T-LC MENTORS (TEACHING-LEARNING COMMUNITIES)

In Ann Arbor, Michigan, older adults have served as volunteer mentors to children and youths at risk of school dropout since 1971. The intergenerational mentoring activity occurs during the school day in classrooms as enrichment to the educational curriculum. After school initiatives include tutoring, gardening and the arts that serve as motivating forces with children and youths to make healthy life choices now and for the future.

Mentors work cooperatively with school staff and parents to increase self esteem, school attendance and achievement. Efforts are made to link middle school and high school youths who have economic need to appropriate employment. The mentoring process assists the youth in work skill mastery and in connecting the job effort with further learning.

This low-cost but powerful prevention initiative benefits the children and youths, their families, the older mentors, and the whole community. Twenty schools continue to be served in Ann Arbor. Adaptations of

the T-LC Mentors model have been made in all fifty states.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. President, I am pleased today to join several of my colleagues in introducing legislation that will address both the underutilization of one of this country's most valuable resources—senior citizens—and the need of students for adult role models in the schools.

The National Mentor Corps Act will authorize the use of intergenerational mentoring programs under chapter 2 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. It will not force schools to establish such programs but rather provides the opportunity to use intergenerational mentoring as a means of improving the self-esteem and scholastic achievements of our students.

Few people would disagree that our children could benefit from increased interaction with adults in their lives. Unfortunately, many of this country's children do not have an adequate number of adult role models in their lives. Through no fault of teachers, all of whom have dedicated their lives to helping children, many students cannot possibly get the attention they need in crowded classrooms.

The proposal before us today will address this situation by encouraging adults, particularly senior citizens, to go into the public schools and provide a steady hand to those youngsters who are drifting in a sea of apathy, fear, and self-doubt.

Further, this legislation seeks to capitalize on the vast, untapped resource of older Americans who are seeking to maintain ties to their community.

The spirit of community service is one of the strongest threads woven through the fabric of America. Whether it was fighting a fire, raising a barn, teaching the young, or caring for the sick, our communities had to pull together and work for the common good to survive and prosper.

Now, perhaps more than ever before, we need to return to this spirit of community and unselfish sharing.

Today, we are at a crossroads. As a nation, we are unsettled, unsure of the future, and in need of a new dedication of purpose. We all know these are not ordinary times. Indeed, we seem to be living in that age envisioned by the poet, Yeats, who wrote that:

Turning and turning in the widening gyre
The falcon cannot hear the falconer;
Things fall apart; the centre cannot hold;
Mere anarchy is loosed upon the world,
The blood-dimmed tide is loosed, and every-
where

The ceremony of innocence is drowned;
The best lack all conviction, while the worst
Are full of passionate intensity.

Today we face an enemy that has persuaded us that as a nation we have lost our way, and most importantly our will to do what is necessary to prevail.

The enemy is a clever, constantly changing chameleon. It wears the face

of poverty, of greed and avarice, of indifference, of closed businesses, of moral bankruptcy. It releases the poisonous vapors of racial hatred, of hopelessness and despair, of drug-fueled violence, and of environmental degradation. It is an enemy that makes everyone blameworthy and no one responsible.

It is the enemy within us—the voice that seeks private gain over public good, that promotes special interest at the expense of the Nation's well-being.

Today, the involvement of all citizens in restoring this Nation—in allowing the center to hold, as Yeats put it—is absolutely necessary. We are losing our sense of community, and we must work to restore the fabric of our Nation.

One can quickly list the problems we now face, and no doubt forget a few important ones. Poverty, drugs, teenage pregnancy, health care, unemployment, education, homelessness—these are problems as daunting today as were disease, harsh winters, lawlessness, and mere survival to the earliest settlers.

I am very pleased that the legislation being introduced today makes a special effort to seek the involvement of senior citizens in the mentoring program. In my work on senior volunteer programs, I have been inspired by the enormous contributions made by seniors to their communities because of their commitment to serving others.

This legislation will provide the means to work together to resolve our problems, and recognizes how important it is to bind generations together.

I am very pleased to be an original cosponsor of this bill. I hope my colleagues will join me in supporting this simple but meaningful proposal.

By Mr. BAUCUS (for himself and Mr. CHAFEE):

S. 1008. A bill to conduct a comprehensive assessment of the Nation's biological resources; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

SURVEY OF NATION'S BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES ACT OF 1993

• Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, last month President Clinton announced that he was asking the Interior Department "to create a national biological survey to help us protect endangered species and, just as importantly, to help the agricultural and biotechnical industries of our country identify new sources of food, fiber, and medication."

To establish this survey, Secretary Babbitt has proposed an internal reorganization within the Department of the Interior which would combine portions of the scientific research activities of eight departmental bureaus into one new bureau—a National Biological Survey. I commend Secretary Babbitt for his efforts "to provide the scientific knowledge America needs to balance the compatible goals of ecosystem protection and economic progress."

I believe that better, more complete information is needed concerning the status and distribution of the Nation's biological resources. I share Secretary Babbitt's view that this type of information will help prevent economic and environmental train wrecks, such as the Pacific Northwest forest crisis. And I am convinced President Clinton is correct. Better information about our biological resources is essential to sustain production of timber, livestock and agricultural commodities, as well as other important economic development.

Many important questions need to be answered about the best means of establishing a biological survey within the Interior Department. Secretary Babbitt has put forth a serious, detailed proposal in an amendment to the Interior Department's budget request for fiscal year 1994. It deserves thorough consideration by Congress through its authorization and appropriation processes.

Consequently, I am today, along with the distinguished ranking minority member of the Environment and Public Works Committee, Senator CHAFEE, introducing legislation that would authorize implementation of Secretary Babbitt's proposal. My purpose in introducing this bill is to facilitate the establishment of a national biological survey, and to provide an opportunity for broad, public discussion of Secretary Babbitt's proposal.

Consistent with Secretary Babbitt's proposal, therefore, the bill would require the Secretary of the Interior to establish an office to survey the Nation's biological resources. The office would be headed by a Director appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Director would be supervised by the Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks and must, by reason of scientific education and experience, have demonstrated expertise in the biological sciences.

The purposes of the biological survey required by this legislation would be: First, to conduct a comprehensive assessment of the Nation's biological resources; second, to provide information to be used in protecting and managing ecosystems; third, to provide information to be used in the sustainable development of the Nation's natural resources; and fourth, to help avoid and resolve conflicts arising in implementation of the Endangered Species Act.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1008

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Biological Survey Act of 1993".

SEC. 2. ESTABLISHMENT OF BIOLOGICAL SURVEY.

Section 3 of the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956 (16 U.S.C. 742b) is amended by adding the following new subsection:

"(e) BIOLOGICAL SURVEY.—

"(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary of the Interior shall undertake a survey of the Nation's biological resources.

"(2) PURPOSES.—The purposes of the survey established under paragraph (1) shall be to—

"(A) conduct a comprehensive baseline assessment and document the status and trends of the biological resources of the United States;

"(B) provide information to be used in protecting and managing ecosystems, including their plant, fish, and wildlife components;

"(C) provide information to be used in the sustainable development of the Nation's natural resources; and

"(D) assist the Secretary in anticipating, avoiding, or resolving conflicts arising in the implementation of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 and other fisheries and wildlife conservation laws.

"(3) FUNCTIONS.—In carrying out the survey established under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall—

"(A) assess and study biological resources, including plants, fish, wildlife, and ecosystems and their components;

"(B) develop, test, and monitor methods of ecosystem management in order to improve the capability of the Secretary to conserve biological resources and diversity;

"(C) collect and analyze data and information to determine, inventory, and monitor the distribution, abundance, health, status, and trends of biological resources and ecosystems;

"(D) in consultation with State agencies responsible for the management and conservation of fish, wildlife, or plant resources within a State, including state natural heritage programs, and other appropriate parties, devise and implement methodologies to access existing sources of information on biological resources;

"(E) develop methods for the consistent and systematic collection and analysis of data on ecosystems and their components;

"(F) disseminate information to resource managers, State agencies, scientists, and the public;

"(G) provide technical assistance in support of legislative, regulatory, and resource management decisions; and

"(H) perform international activities related to the management of biological resources.

"(4) OFFICE AND DIRECTOR.—

"(A) The Secretary of the Interior shall establish within the Department of the Interior an office to assist in conducting the biological survey established under paragraph (1). Such office shall be headed by a Director who shall—

"(i) be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, from among individuals who, by reason of scientific education and experience, have demonstrated expertise in the biological sciences; and

"(ii) be compensated at the rate provided for level V of the Executive Schedule.

"(B) The Director shall be subject to the supervision of the Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife."

SEC. 3. CONFORMING AMENDMENT.

Section 5316 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to the Director, United States Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, the following:

"Director of the Biological Survey, Department of the Interior." •

• Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, one problem in pursuing the goal of conserving our natural heritage, including endangered species, is that we lack an adequate inventory of our own biological resources. Without an adequate biological information base, it is difficult to stem the decline of species before they become endangered and, in turn, avoid environmental and economic train wrecks such as that associated with the spotted owl in the Pacific Northwest.

Secretary of the Interior Babbitt has proposed that we establish a National Biological Survey [NBS], to provide better and more complete information regarding the status and distribution of the Nation's species and the ecosystems upon which they depend. NBS would also make this data available to the scientific community and the public. This information will aid decisionmakers in planning for both conservation and economic needs.

The legislation that I am introducing today, along with the distinguished Chairman of the Environment and Public Works Committee, Senator BAUCUS, would authorize the establishment of NBS as has been outlined by the Secretary. Consistent with Secretary Babbitt's proposal, it would establish an office within the Department of the Interior which would be headed by a Director appointed by the President, confirmed by the Senate, and under the supervision of the Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks.

Although I strongly support establishing a program to improve natural resource inventory and monitoring, I am not yet convinced that creating a separate office or bureau is the best means to accomplish this objective. Nevertheless, Secretary Babbitt has put forward a detailed proposal which merits the full consideration of Congress. The introduction of this bill is intended to serve as a starting point and to provide an opportunity for a full discussion of how best to improve our information about species and ecosystems.

Knowledge regarding biological resources is of great economic value. For instance, more than 40 percent of all prescription drugs are derived from plants and other organisms. Yet, fewer than 3 percent of the world's known species have been examined for possible use as medicines. This data could also be used to develop and improve agricultural crops and in biotechnology research. Such knowledge will benefit all of us.

If we are going to get ahead of the curve and conserve species before they become endangered, we need better and more comprehensive information about species and ecosystems. The establishment of the National Biological Survey could assist government and private in-

terests alike in managing natural resources more effectively and avoiding conflicts with economic interests. •

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 70

At the request of Mr. COCHRAN, the name of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. PRESSLER] was added as a cosponsor of S. 70, a bill to reauthorize the National Writing Project, and for other purposes.

S. 226

At the request of Mr. DASCHLE, the name of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. KERREY] was added as a cosponsor of S. 226, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide that certain cash rentals of farmland will not cause recapture of special estate tax valuation.

S. 289

At the request of Mr. REID, the names of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. DASCHLE] and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. WOFFORD] were added as cosponsors of S. 289, a bill to amend section 118 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for certain exceptions from rules for determining contributions in aid of construction, and for other purposes.

S. 462

At the request of Mr. BUMPERS, the name of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. SIMON] was added as a cosponsor of S. 462, a bill to prohibit the expenditure of appropriated funds on the United States International Space Station Freedom Program.

S. 466

At the request of Mr. DASCHLE, the name of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. HOLLINGS] was added as a cosponsor of S. 466, a bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to provide for Medicaid coverage of all certified nurse practitioners and clinical nurse specialists services.

S. 484

At the request of Mr. DASCHLE, the name of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ROCKEFELLER] was added as a cosponsor of S. 484, a bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage of alcoholism and drug dependency residential treatment services for pregnant women and certain family members under the Medicaid Program, and for other purposes.

S. 518

At the request of Mr. BUMPERS, the name of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. DASCHLE] was added as a cosponsor of S. 518, a bill to reduce the deficit by limiting the amount of appropriations which may be available to the intelligence community for fiscal year 1994.

S. 519

At the request of Mr. BUMPERS, the name of the Senator from Vermont

[Mr. JEFFORDS] was added as a cosponsor of S. 519, a bill to reduce Federal budget deficits by prohibiting further funding of the Trident II ballistic missile program.

S. 649

At the request of Mr. RIEGLE, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. CHAFEE] was added as a cosponsor of S. 649, a bill to ensure proper and full implementation by the Department of Health and Human Services of Medicaid coverage for certain low-income Medicare beneficiaries.

S. 764

At the request of Mr. WOFFORD, the name of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. LEVIN] was added as a cosponsor of S. 764, a bill to exclude service of election officials and election workers from the Social Security payroll tax.

S. 923

At the request of Mr. DASCHLE, the name of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ROCKEFELLER] was added as a cosponsor of S. 923, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide a comprehensive program for the prevention of fetal alcohol syndrome, and for other purposes.

S. 993

At the request of Mr. KEMP THORNE, the name of the Senator from Alaska [Mr. STEVENS] was added as a cosponsor of S. 993, a bill to end the practice of imposing unfunded Federal mandates on States and local governments and to ensure that the Federal Government pays the costs incurred by those governments in complying with certain requirements under Federal statutes and regulations.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 72

At the request of Mr. RIEGLE, the name of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. COCHRAN] was added as a cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 72, a joint resolution to designate the last week of September 1993, and the last week of September of 1994, as "National Senior Softball Week."

SENATE RESOLUTION 111—TO AUTHORIZE THE SENATE ETHICS STUDY COMMISSION, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. MITCHELL (for himself and Mr. DOLE) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 111

Resolved, That—

SECTION 1. SENATE ETHICS STUDY COMMISSION.—(a) ESTABLISHMENT AND PURPOSES.—There is established in the Senate the Ethics Study Commission (hereinafter referred to as "Commission") for the purposes of—

(1) conducting a study of rules and procedures relating to the Senate Select Committee on Ethics; and

(2) taking such actions as may be required to support the purpose specified in paragraph (1).

(b) MEMBERSHIP.—The Commission shall be composed of the following members:

(1) the Chairman of the Select Committee on Ethics, who shall serve as Chairman of the Commission;

(2) the Vice Chairman of the Select Committee on Ethics;

(3) the members of the Select Committee on Ethics; and

(4) such former members of the Select Committee on Ethics (including current and former Members of the Senate) as the Majority Leader, in consultation with the Minority Leader, shall recommend to be appointed by the President pro tempore of the Senate.

(c) VACANCIES.—Vacancies in the membership of the Commission shall not affect the authority of the remaining members to conduct the business of the Commission.

(d) CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this resolution shall be construed as restricting the authority of the Select Committee on Ethics or otherwise changing the authority of any committee of the Senate.

SECTION 2. SERVICES OF STAFF.—The Chairman of the Commission may designate Senate staff to assist the Commission; however, no additional staff shall be employed by the Commission under the authority of this resolution.

SECTION 3. GENERAL AUTHORITY.—For the purposes of this resolution, the Commission—

(a) is authorized in its discretion,

(1) to hold hearings;

(2) to sit and act at any time or place during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate; and

(b) shall be deemed a committee of the Senate for the conduct of hearings, including for the purpose of having printed and bound the testimony and other data presented at such hearings.

SECTION 4. EXPENSES.—(a) In carrying out its duties under the authority and purposes of this resolution, from March 4, 1993 through December 31, 1993, the Commission is authorized to make such expenditures as may be necessary from the Contingent Fund of the Senate.

(b) Expenditures from the Contingent Fund shall be paid out of the appropriations account "Miscellaneous Items" upon vouchers approved by the Chairman of the Commission, except that vouchers shall not be required for—

(1) the payment of expenses for stationery supplies purchased through the Keeper of the Stationery, United States Senate;

(2) the payment of expenses for postage to the Postmaster, United States Senate;

(3) the payment of metered charges on copying equipment provided by the Sergeant at Arms, United States Senate; or

(4) the payment of expenses for telecommunications services provided by the Telecommunications Department, Sergeant at Arms, United States Senate.

SECTION 5. REPORT.—The Commission shall report its findings and recommendations to the Majority Leader and the Minority Leader upon the conclusion of its study.

SECTION 6. TERMINATION.—The provisions of this resolution shall be deemed effective March 4, 1993, and shall terminate on December 31, 1993.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. BOREN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the full Committee on Environment and Public

Works be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Friday, May 21, beginning at 9:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing on proposals to establish a Federal program to encourage the development and use of environmental technologies.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. BOREN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Friday, May 21, 1993, at 10 a.m., to hold an oversight hearing on the Television Oversight Program Improvement Act of 1990.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

UNSENTIMENTAL JOURNEY

• Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, a number of our colleagues and I recently had the pleasure of attending a reception at the home of our mutual friends Sue and Sandy Greenberg, in honor of Ernestine Schlant Bradley, Albert Drach and the American publication of an "Unsentimental Journey" by Mr. Drach, afterward by Ms. Schlant. It was a very special evening and gave us all a renewed appreciation of Ernestine's brilliance and strength. I request to place in the RECORD the remarks made that evening.

The remarks follow:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR BILL BRADLEY

The only person that I know that works harder than I do is my wife. For fourteen years she has taught four courses at Montclair State College every semester. Then she has written virtually hundreds of articles and book reviews, several books, had a hand in two books that just came out and are here tonight, raised a daughter, been a great political wife, met the demands of her husband, occasionally, and needless to say, is a very special human being. And that is why I'm really quite pleased and honored and grateful to two wonderful friends, Sandy Greenberg and Sue Greenberg for hosting tonight's affair for Ernestine. Sandy and Sue Greenberg are friends of many years, our daughters are classmates—Kathryn and Theresa Anne. Theresa Anne is on her way, needless to say, she's a basketball player. And the time I met Sandy and took his measure was once when he purchased my services. Now for those who are interested in professional ethics, don't get itchy. Every year I auction at the Sidwell auction my services to anyone who wants to buy them to play with four of that person's friends a three on three basketball game. As the years pass it becomes more and more difficult. But several years ago, Sandy bought this three on three basketball game. Now for those of you that don't know, Sandy is blind, and I went out on the court, his two fine sons and he were playing me and two other people. And I said, who do I guard? You have Sandy Greenberg—but he's uh uh, he said please, up please . . . just stay with him. So I stayed

with him and the rule was if you got the ball at the foul line, you had to give him room to shoot. And I am here tonight to testify that blind men can shoot. But beyond that, Sandy is an enormously successful businessman, he is an adviser to presidents, he is a man of tremendous philanthropic endeavor, but relevant to tonight, he and Sue both are tremendous friends to both Ernestine and me. I would like to thank Sandy and introduce Sandy who will introduce Ernestine.

SANFORD D. GREENBERG

Thank you Bill Bradley for those very kind words. Sue, Kathryn, Paul, Jimmy and I are grateful to you for your generous thoughts, as well as your friendship. We are delighted to welcome you all to our home.

We are gathered here tonight to celebrate the American publication of an "Unsentsimental Journey" by the great but still under-celebrated Austrian novelist Albert Drach, and to honor the courage of the woman—our dear friend Ernestine Schlant Bradley—whose dedication and persistence made it happen.

"Unsentsimental Journey" is an autobiographical novel about an Austrian lawyer, half-Jewish, who flees from Vienna to Vichy France to escape the Nazis and spends the War surviving. It is a book about people and life on the edge—indeed beyond the edge; where to survive is to live only in the sense that one continues to breathe. In a word, it is a book about the Holocaust.

I know there are some who may wonder whether the world needs another book about the Holocaust. To them, I have five responses. First, Bosnia. Second, Somalia. Third, Cambodia. Fourth, unbelievably, Germany. And fifth, this is a novel, not a work of journalism.

Fiction grabs us and, even in difficult books like this one, compels us to engage in a way that non-fiction cannot. Headlines of four hundred thousand Bosnians dying in the cold fade to reports of the Strategic Petroleum Reserve; both go in one year and out the other. Novels, when they enable us to witness the pain and suffering, the joy and relief of individual human beings, capture our souls because we can imagine ourselves or our loved ones as those individuals. "Unsentsimental Journey," like Solzhenitsyn's description of the gulag, allows us to ponder how we might respond, whether as victims, government officials or mere observers, to ultimate challenges to our courage and our morality.

That we have the opportunity to read it tonight is a tribute to Ernestine Schlant's passion and courage. German-born, she knows well that there are many who do not wish to be reminded of the Holocaust even as its echoes begin to be heard again in central Europe. Nonetheless, she has for a decade labored tirelessly to bring Mr. Drach's painful message to both the German and English-speaking worlds.

Ernestine, I cannot say I enjoyed reading "Unsentsimental Journey." I know all too well whose role I would have played. Still, I commend it to all of you and to all who—in a world full of mind-numbing horrors—still wish to be able to respond emotionally to the suffering of our fellow human beings. In closing, let me make one final observation: at the end of the novel the protagonist, having survived the Nazis while so many of his friends and relatives have died, turns on the gas in his apartment and lies down. In real life, Albert Drach picked himself up, returned to Austria, reclaimed his family's home, married, had children and resumed, even to this hour, his writing. How appro-

priate that as her own difficult journey comes to an end, Ernestine Schlant has brought Albert Drach's genius to Washington a scant week after the Inauguration of another man from Hope.

It is my great honor and pleasure to introduce our dear friend, Ernestine Schlant Bradley.

ERNESTINE SCHLANT BRADLEY

First of all, I really do want to thank Sandy and Sue not just for opening their house, but for opening their hearts and hosting this event and bringing us all together. And I want to say this is one of the highlights, not just of the last week, or the last weeks or the last months but really of many years and all the work that has gone into them, too. What I want to say about the two books is very brief. The book on West German and Japanese literature is really an outcome of curiosity. I wanted to find out to what extent the two countries now, show or do not show any similarities or any parallels since their political history in the last hundred years have been very similar. And as Sandy has already said so eloquently, we trust the novelists who write about the souls. We trust the politicians as practitioners, we trust the journalists for, you know, the fluff, but when we really want to know what's going on, we have to read literature. So I thought we should read the contemporary German and Japanese literature and see who the contemporary Germans and Japanese are, not by what the reporters tell us, but by what the literature says. The Wilson Center was very hospitable to the idea and hosted a conference where we had contributors from Japan, Germany and United States, and the outcome is this book. There are several people here, Sam Wells, Mike Haltzel, Joe Brinley—all of whom really worked very hard to bring this book out and I'm very happy that it came out, it's a first in comparative studies and we'll have to see whether any other center or institute may follow up and host a second conference so that we can come up with an even more detailed study. This project can stand on its own. However, my heart really is with Albert Drach. I think Sandy already spoke so eloquently about him, I don't need to say much more. Drach is 90 years old. He's still alive. He lives outside of Vienna. He is the only writer that I know in Austrian literature whose creative work spares from the last days of the Austrian empire into the present. He is very vitriolic. I think in fact, it's his anger that keeps him going. I hope that you will read his book which is about his exile in France.

Michael Berenbaum is also here: he is under heavy pressure to do a book review on Unsentsimental Journey and I hope there will be other opportunities yet to spread Drach's reputation. The book was written originally after World War II, the notes were taken as he was in exile, but the English translation just came out. We try to get as many reviews on the book as possible, and sell as many copies and get as many people to know about it as possible. Sandy and Sue were so generous: they ordered the copies for this party, whereupon the publishing company in California said, Oh my gosh, another order like this, and this is a best seller. I'm very, very happy that Sue and Sandy made this possible. When you read the book, don't think you can read it with the ease of a best seller. It's not a book that you can just sit down and relax with. The subject matter is very painful and Drach challenges you. He dares you to put the book down. I hope you pick up the challenge and you will read the book and I think we'll all be better for it if we do that.

Thank you very, very much for being here. •

INDONESIA'S FORGOTTEN WAR

• Mr. DURENBERGER. Mr. President, my interest in the human rights situation in East Timor is well known. The record of the Indonesian Government regarding internationally accepted human rights in this region is unacceptable. It is my belief that the international community must continue to hold the government of Indonesia accountable for their treatment of East Timorese.

I wish to take this opportunity to share with my colleagues an article from the most recent issue of the Indonesian quarterly, written by a former staff member of the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, Anne Greene.

The article, a review of John Taylor's book "Indonesia's Forgotten War: The Hidden History of East Timor," not only provides a substantial history of the volatile situation in East Timor, but also suggests possible scenarios for the future of East Timor.

The situation in East Timor does not garner a great deal of attention. This article, as well as the book it discusses, makes a significant contribution to the education of the international community regarding this matter. I wish to especially express my appreciation to Anne Greene for her continuing interest and involvement in this issue.

Mr. President, I ask that the text of the article be included in the RECORD, and I urge my colleagues' attention to it.

The article follows:

[From the Indonesian Quarterly, XXI/1]

INDONESIA'S FORGOTTEN WAR

("Indonesia's Forgotten War: The Hidden History of East Timor," by John G. Taylor. London & New Jersey: Zed Books, Ltd., 1991, 230 pp. + xiii. It includes an introduction, chronology of events in East Timor since 1974, bibliography and index. This review article is written by Anne Green.)

Little is generally known about this subject, and aside from newspaper and occasional journal articles, less has been written about it. For the truly uninitiated, an explanation of the title of the book is in order. Indonesia's "war," is a reference to military and other methods employed by Indonesia to integrate East Timor. East and West Timor share a small island in the east part of the Indonesian archipelago. West Timor has historically been part of Indonesia, but East Timor was a Portuguese colony until the 1970s when, according to different observers, it either opted for integration with Indonesia or it was forced to integrate, a difference of opinion that is the heart of this work.

The situation in East Timor since 1991 has become increasingly volatile. On 12 November of that year in Dili, the capital of East Timor, Indonesian troops shot into a group of mourners after one of the soldiers had been stabbed, killing at least fifty. The group had been attending a memorial mass for a person killed earlier that week by the army. That young man had favoured an independent East Timor.

Domestic and international repercussions of that violence are still occurring. In December 1992, Xanana Gusmao, a founder of Fretilin, East Timor's principal pro-independence organization, was captured by the armed forces in the basement of a house near Dili, after having been turned in by neighbours. His arrest has received considerable publicity in Jakarta, where he is being detained, and his trial, which began 1 February in Dili, will undoubtedly revive questions concerning Indonesia's relationship with East Timor and the legality of its incorporation.

In 1989, Eastern Europe broke away from the Soviet Union and in 1991, the USSR itself came apart. On the first day of 1993, Czechoslovakia, divided into two parts. In the aftermath of the Cold War, a trend has developed toward the establishment of small and homogeneous states. The breakdown of the former Yugoslav Republic provides another example of this tendency, demonstrating that federation had failed to erase bitter memories and nationalist dreams. Dealing with the desire for self determination and making smaller states viable are two emerging challenges for the 1990s.

States have a tendency to view the world in their own image, as a collection of other nation states equally bent on modernization. However, many people residing in states belong to traditional societies, whose focus is much more local. States characteristically overlook them, undervalue them, or press them to assimilate. It is not fashionable to find intrinsic value in these societies. This publication looks at the effects of national and international relations on a traditional society and the continuing resistance to unification from some inhabitants of a remote part of an enormous nation.

Indonesia is young, dating only from 17 August 1945. However, it has become the fourth largest nation in the world with the dissolution of the Soviet Union. It includes more than thirteen thousand islands and peoples of many ethnic backgrounds and religions. A state philosophy called Pancasila and a national language, Bahasa Indonesia, are principal factors in its unity. East Timor is one of only a very few parts of the archipelago where pockets of resistance to incorporation continue to exist.

John G. Taylor, the author of *Indonesia's Forgotten War*, is a British sociologist, who has written two volumes on the sociology of development. He is also the editor of *Timor Link* for the Catholic Institute for International Relations. This book is written from the perspective of a sociologist, alarmed at the destabilization of traditional Timorese society. It also reflects the perspective of one who has followed the fate of the Church and Catholics in East Timor.

Taylor's goals in writing this volume are straightforward. In the Introduction, he writes that they are to inform readers about the history of East Timor, to help its populace become independent, and to inspire other movements for national autonomy. He himself was active in the British Campaign for an Independent East Timor in late 1970s.

Taylor views Timorese history as a sorry saga of European and Asian colonialism. The first and most enduring colonizers were the Portuguese, who established a settlement on the island of Solor in 1599, beat off a challenge by the Dutch, but were forced out by the Japanese during World War Two, returning afterwards, only to be replaced by Indonesia.

The Portuguese were satisfied to reap the labour of the Timorese until 1898, when the

Portuguese Royal Commission demanded more aggressive control and development of the colony. Thereafter, the colonialists forced the Timorese into work gangs, redistributed their land, and focussed on raising crops for export. In the process, they destabilized traditional structures of the society and its economy and coopted its leaders, the *liurai* and *suco* chiefs.

A major theme in this publication is that from the time Portugal decided to decolonize, Indonesia intended to take over and began to plan for it, despite claims to the contrary. According to Taylor, the Indonesian military intelligence service, Bakin, was in the vanguard.

A principal topic in this book, to which approximately half of the volume is dedicated, is a description of the Indonesian takeover and incorporation of East Timor. The author names and describes various operations and depicts tactics used as frustration mounted at the inability to eliminate the opposition.

An important role was played by the Church in East Timor. Although the Church had been the dominant provider of education in East Timor since the eighteenth century, its role was evidently limited since ninety-three per cent of the population in 1973 was illiterate. On 12 October 1989, the Pope went to East Timor. After consecrating the cathedral, he said mass to an overflowing crowd of 100,000. His message was restrained. The Pope simply called on "those responsible for life in East Timor (to) act with wisdom and goodwill for all." He did not say, as he had six years earlier in Haiti, that "things must change here, if faut que les choses changement ici." Even so, following the mass, some of the audience began to shout independence slogans, soldiers intervened and there was a violent melee. Thereafter, the local Church became an important focus of opposition to the Indonesian presence, calling for a referendum on integration and documentation of human rights abuses.

The author concludes that the combat had reached a military stalemate by the mid 1980s, leading the army to return to an earlier strategy of holding strategic locations and attempting to keep the Fretilin forces at bay. The Government sought to show that the political situation was under control by holding trials of Fretilin forces beginning in 1984. By the end of that year, one hundred and ninety-five prisoners had been tried under Articles 106, 198, and 110 of the Indonesian Criminal Code, then given sentences ranging from two to seventeen years although many had already been in jail for years.

A final theme in this volume is the international reaction to events in East Timor and the writer speculates on actions that could be taken, but concludes that the probability of action on East Timor's behalf is increasingly unlikely. Initially, the United Nations reaffirmed East Timor's right to self-determination and called for negotiations by representatives from Fretilin, Indonesia, and Portugal. But by 1982, that margin of support had narrowed and the wording was changed to "interested parties" so that just Portugal and Indonesia would participate in the talks. The Human Rights Committee, one of the institutions in the United Nations intended to access of human rights violations, even removed it from the agenda in 1985, which Taylor blames on a powerful Indonesian lobbying effort. In his view, credit for keeping the issue alive at the United Nations lies with the non-governmental organizations (NGOs).

What is the future for East Timor? The author visualizes five scenarios: an Indonesian

victory over the Fretilin, a Fretilin victory over the Indonesian forces, an Indonesian referendum manipulating a vote for merger, a plan to give East Timor limited political autonomy, and change caused by outside pressure on Indonesia.

Taylor presents his arguments for why none of these scenarios will succeed. Indonesia will not gain a victory over Fretilin because Fretilin will always be able to evade the combatants. Fretilin forces are unlikely to be victorious either with only about 2,000 members—in the absence of an upsurge in separatist movements. A referendum is unlikely since Indonesia will not want the problem brought to international attention. Limited political autonomy for East Timor is doubtful because Indonesia does not want to stop fighting or increase East Timor participation in the system. International pressure is unlikely to increase due to Indonesian lobbying efforts. Portugal, which continues to make the case with the European Community, could get tired and give up. Taylor concludes that change in relations between East Timor and Indonesia will only occur if there is a new government in Jakarta. Even then, change could be slow and limited in scope.

There are a number of problems with this book, ranging from minor to substantive. Many of the more minor are related to editing.

Taylor is frank about his position on East Timor, but inflammatory language, overstatements, and under-reporting raise questions about the accuracy of the account. Throughout the text the Indonesian presence in East Timor is referred to as its "invasion of East Timor." In Chapter Twelve on page 180, the writer claims the United States, Australia, and Japan could have influenced things in the mid-1970's, "but the need to appease the Indonesian military became paramount."

The most serious shortcoming of the volume is its one dimensionality. The Indonesian Government, particularly BAKIN and the armed forces, are presented as evil. He claims that entire nations have turned a blind eye to conditions in East Timor for self centered economic, strategic, and political reasons. By contrast, the indigenous society of East Timor and Fretilin are virtuous and blameless. In Chapter Five, while the combatants devastate the urban areas, Fretilin forces live peacefully in the mountains, growing crops, sending their children to school, and holding meetings with the community "for political clarification on the evolution of the struggle." From this laudatory description, the reader may wonder how other parties managed to attract any members, what frictions caused Fretilin to splinter, and why it has had so much trouble presenting its case in the international arena.

Some of the author's assertions are exaggerated, such as his equation of armed combat, transmigration, and birth control as horrors imposed by Indonesia to quell the Timorese. Taylor is particularly incensed about the introduction of World Bank funded family planning centers that want Timorese to limit their families to three children each. However, public policy encourages all Indonesians to limit their families to two children; the rationale for this policy is apparent to anyone who has been to Indonesia.

Some of the writer's arguments are cynical and counterintuitive, as in Chapter Thirteen, where Taylor asserts that the military is unlikely to pull out of East Timor because it is quite happy to be there, providing troops with combat practice in low intensity con-

flict and giving officers an opportunity for promotions and wealth from local investments. East Timor has been a long, expensive, and unpopular engagement, something from which one might assume the combatants and Indonesia, which is an increasingly important player in world events, would like to end.

Since Taylor is involved with the Catholic Church and has followed its activities in East Timor, it is unfortunate that he did not write more about this topic. Who invited the Pope to East Timor? What was his purpose in making this trip. Since the Vatican has not recognized the unification of East Timor and Indonesia, why was the Pope's address so mild? What caused the priests to take courage from the papal visit? In many countries with a Catholic presence, nuns and lay workers, who work most closely with the poor have become the most radicalized. It would have been interesting to know something about this subject.

This work was published in 1991, but it mainly covers events through 1989. An update is already in order as a result of the November 1991 violence in Dili and myriad repercussions; and changes in the international arena.

Despite its shortcomings, this is a valuable and provocative publication that provides English language readers an opportunity to think about the situation in East Timor. In addition, it raises questions of a larger scope concerning the rights of states and traditional societies, the proper role of religion, and the reluctance of states to negotiate differences of opinion. •

CONGRESS IS ONE OF THE PLACES WHERE PEACE IS LACKING

• Mr. KOHL. Mr. President, a few days ago, I received a group of letters and drawings from the sixth grade class at St. Josaphat School in Milwaukee. I have rarely received anything as touching, and as disturbing, as those letters.

These sixth graders, Mr. President, were spending some time studying how to get along peacefully with each other. Their teacher, Mrs. Bergstrom, explained that, while the class was talking about how to get along with each other, "we have noted that * * * peace is sorely lacking in certain areas of our globe. We have also noted that peace is sorely lacking within certain areas of our Nation."

So far so good; just a normal student exercise about getting along with people. But then came the kicker, Mr. President. The teacher's letter continued: "Congress is one of the places where peace is lacking."

"Congress is one of the places where peace is lacking."

A letter that all the students signed asked, "Won't you please stop arguing and begin working with one another peacefully? Maybe, through your good example, you will spread some of your peaceful cooperation to the rest of the country. Maybe you will even spread some of that peace to the rest of the world. Maybe. What is wrong with trying?"

Mr. President, I think they are right: There isn't anything wrong with trying.

Sometimes, no matter how hard we try, we may not be able to agree on some issues, but we can develop compromises on most issues. Here is what one of the students in that sixth grade class wrote in his letter to me: "I solve my problems in my life by discussing my problems. I compromise with the person I am mad at. I think that the Democrats and the Republicans should work together to make a better country."

Mr. President, I honestly think these kids have the right idea. And we ought to listen to them. Again, I don't believe we can find compromises on every issue, but we can find them on most issues. We have to. As another student wrote, if he has a problem with his brother, "we would talk about a way we can both have our problem solved. If we still do not agree, we would help each other." They would help each other because they have to live with each other. So do we, Mr. President, so do we. And we ought to begin doing just that.

Mr. President, I thank the sixth grade class at St. Josaphat School for writing to me. And I will do my best to learn from them. •

CONGRATULATING ISRAEL ON ITS 45TH ANNIVERSARY

• Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I would like my colleagues to note that last Friday, May 14, was the 45th anniversary of Israel's declaration of independence. I would like to mark this occasion by congratulating Israel on its 45 years of democracy and freedom. It may be no coincidence that the Holocaust Memorial here in Washington has just opened, vividly reminding us of a key reason why the State of Israel had to be created. Forty-five years ago, still reeling from the turmoil of war, the Allies were uncertain whether this effort to create a homeland for the Jews would succeed. Thanks to the unflagging determination of the Israeli people, there is now no doubt anywhere in the world that the State of Israel is here to stay.

As Israel has evolved over the half century of its existence, so has America's relationship with Israel. People are sometimes surprised to find that my affinity for the State of Israel comes in part from historical similarities shared with the State of Vermont. While at first glance they may seem very different, both are small lands, and their people are very aware of their uniqueness and are deeply committed to democracy. Israelis and Vermonters are independent and industrious people, working a rugged land, and respecting its environment.

In 1776, Vermont was forced to declare itself an independent republic when competing claims of ownership over Vermont's territory by New Hampshire and New York prevented

Vermont from joining the Union. Rather than submit to domination by either State, Vermont decided to go it alone. Eventually, after some hard bargaining, her neighbors realized the error of their ways and Vermont was allowed to join the Union. It has taken much longer in the Middle East, but I believe Israel's neighbors are slowly coming around.

Like Israel, Vermont has always had an unusual interest in events beyond its borders, engaging in outreach around the globe. Moved by the human suffering in Europe, Vermont declared war on Nazi Germany 3 months before Pearl Harbor. Touched by the plight of Bosnian Moslems, Israel has been airlifting Moslem refugee families to Israel.

As a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, I had the privilege of traveling to the Middle East in February to assess the situation and to measure the commitment of the various parties to the peace process. I was heartened by what I learned, and more convinced than ever that a negotiated solution is possible and is the best hope for lasting peace in the region. At the center of my optimism is the reinvigoration of the Israeli-American relationship.

At each stop on my trip, I saw hopeful signs that the participant nations wanted to get back to the talks. In Damascus, Syrian Foreign Minister al-Shara eagerly conveyed his country's willingness to separate the difficult problem of the Palestinian deportees from the peace talks. Syria is very aware of the political and economic benefits that could come from peace with Israel. While the Foreign Minister did not make light of the many obstacles, it was clear to me that the Syrians are gradually realizing that good relations with their prosperous neighbor offers the best hope for the development of Syria.

The Jordanians were even more anxious to resume peace discussions. Both Israeli and Jordanian officials agree that the outlines of a peace agreement are clear, and a concerted effort in the bilateral talks could complete the document in relatively little time. Jordan clearly wants the benefits peace could bring, but realizes that any agreement with Israel must go hand-in-hand with progress in the negotiations over Palestinian autonomy.

The Israeli-Palestinian negotiating track still seems the most difficult, in part because the issues are considerably more complex, and in part because of the political constraints on each side. The Palestinian delegation is operating under very difficult circumstances, constantly threatened by the increasing power of fundamentalist groups in the occupied territories. The delegates impressed upon me the need for tangible signs of progress that will reassure the Palestinians that negotia-

tions, not extremism or terrorism, are the best hope for a real improvement in their situation.

I was most surprised to learn from Egyptian President Hosni Mubarak of the quiet but active role he plays in the peace process. As the leader of the one Arab government that has made peace with Israel, Mubarak constantly acts as a conduit for information between parties, encouraging his Arab allies to continue the struggle to find common ground. Frequent lengthy conversations between President Mubarak and Prime Minister Rabin provide a unique communications channel that can facilitate progress and diffuse tensions.

While my stop in Israel was too brief, it renewed my enthusiasm for the people, their energy and the spirit of Israel. In spite of torrential rains, we ascended the Mount of Olives to gaze across the valley onto the heights of the Old City.

My eye was drawn to the Dome of the Rock, glistening even in the rain, one of the most holy sites for Moslems, built on the spot where Mohammed is said to have ascended into heaven. This very rock is also claimed by Judeo-Christian scholars as the place where Abraham offered to sacrifice his son Isaac to demonstrate his faith in God. Later that day, on the temple mount we wove our way through underground tunnels to the spots where Israeli archaeologists have located stones from the foundation of King Solomon's temple, laid almost 3,000 years ago. Upon these stones, in the first century B.C., King Herod built the immense walls that surrounded the Second Temple. The western section of the wall, the Wailing Wall, is the one of the most holy places to Jews.

Here, in just a square mile, is encapsulated the riddle of the Middle East—Judaism, Islam, and Christianity all claiming the same sites of land as being central to their history and beliefs. Prior to 1967, the old city of Jerusalem was under Jordanian control and closed to Jews, thus barring them from access to their holy sites. Since 1967, Israel has insisted that the city be open to all, and thousands of people of all faiths come every day to worship in peace. Looking out over this historic and dynamic city, it is clear to me that Israel's City of David must never again be divided so that it remain forever open to all people.

My meetings with Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin and Foreign Minister Shimon Peres provided the opportunity to candidly exchange views on many issues. I expressed concern that Israel continue to work hard on reforming its economy, encouraging greater privatization and efficiency. As America struggles to return its economy to health, we must ensure that every dollar invested overseas is spent wisely. I was assured that the Israeli leadership

shares this conviction and places the highest priority on economic reform.

We discussed the peace process at length, agreeing that every effort must be made to seize the opportunity to move toward a sustainable peace. I shared my concern about the unrest in the territories, my opposition to heavy-handed responses, and my support for longstanding U.S. policy of opposing the building of settlements outside the green line. Having pushed hard for years for the right of Soviet Jews to emigrate, I backed the loan guarantees, but believe that they must be spent in accordance with United States policy if they are to be supported by the American public. The Prime Minister assured me that American conditions on loan guarantees are being scrupulously followed.

We discussed the difficulty of combating terrorism in a democracy and the necessity of preventing extremists from holding a veto over the peace process. I was encouraged by the Prime Minister's commitment to ending the standoff with the Palestinian deportees while remaining firm against terrorism. Foreign Minister Peres stressed that the food on which fundamentalism feeds is poverty, and that a political settlement must provide for economic development and political autonomy for the Palestinians.

I was pleased to learn of the Labor government's support for my position that the gulf war brought home the necessity of curtailing arms sales to the region. I supported taking military action against Saddam Hussein and I greatly admired the restraint shown by Israel when Scud missiles were launched against Tel Aviv. Clearly, there is no shortage of military equipment in the region. While the war created an international consensus that more must be done to limit the flow of weapons, it has proved hard for any country to follow through when jobs at home are at stake. The recent sale of F-15's to Saudi Arabia provides an example. Believing that this sale was not in America's long-term interest, I was one of the few Senators to speak out publicly last fall in opposition to the sale in spite of the potential economic benefit for Vermont.

The question of next year's levels of U.S. foreign aid came up as well. I indicated my commitment to aid to Israel and Egypt, especially at this delicate time in the peace process. Any cut in aid at this critical point in the peace process could be construed as a lack of American resolve to see the peace process through. After all we have invested, Israel must be confident that our commitment is not wavering.

I realize foreign aid is very difficult to sell to the American people, I am convinced that the wisest investment we can make is in efforts to bring peace to the region. Not only will stability in the region allow us to cut

back on our defense expenditures, but it will also expand the markets for American goods, the key to maintaining our standard of living.

There continues to be some progress in the peace talks, but I am concerned that all of the parties have not pledged to commit themselves to the negotiations until an agreement is reached. Only Israel has made a long-term commitment to the talks, recognizing the urgency of seizing this moment of opportunity. I hope the other parties will commit to an immediate resumption of the discussions and commit to seeing the process through.

While the coming months will no doubt bring some bumps in the road, I am most encouraged by the vigor I see in the relationship between and the commitment of the new American and Israeli Governments to work together. There is excitement throughout the Middle East that peace is not only possible, but could bring tangible benefits to all the people of the region. It is my belief that the strength of the American-Israeli friendship is the key to making this long-sought dream a reality.●

FACES OF THE HEALTH CARE CRISIS IN MICHIGAN—THE IMPACT OF HIGH HEALTH CARE COSTS ON FAMILY BUSINESSES

● Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. President, as part of my continuing effort to focus on the critical need for health care reform, I would like to highlight today the impact of skyrocketing health insurance premiums on small business owners.

Gerald and Sue Gibson, from Sturgis, MI, have owned a trucking business since 1978. They are the sole employees of the company. Like many small businesses across America, the Gibson family business is struggling to stay afloat during difficult economic times. The Gibsons wrote to me in August 1992, to tell me how escalating health insurance premiums have made their struggle even harder.

I will ask that this letter be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

Sue and Gerald had been purchasing health insurance coverage for themselves for the past 20 years. But, they are unable to keep up with the high cost of health insurance. Some ten months ago, the Gibsons gave up their health insurance coverage to maintain the economic viability of their business.

The escalating cost of premiums has put health insurance beyond their financial means. In 1988, the premium cost for the Gibsons' health insurance was about \$67 a month with a yearly deductible of \$1,200. By 1992, the premium cost had risen to \$439 a month for basically the same policy. This was for a no-frills policy that only covered hospitalizations. It did not cover doc-

tor visits, prescriptions, or outpatient services.

Luckily the Gibson's out-of-pocket expenses have been relatively low. Their major expense is a prescription to control Gerald's blood pressure which costs \$40 a month. But, because they have had to give up their insurance, they now live in fear of an unforeseen illness or accident that would require hospitalization. While they have never filed a health insurance claim and neither of them has ever been hospitalized, they are concerned that their good health will not continue forever. They fear they could be turned away by hospitals if they get sick, because they have no health insurance. They worry that they may lose their home should one of them need to be hospitalized.

The Gibsons are willing to pay for health insurance, they are not looking for a free ride. They just cannot afford the skyrocketing premiums. Since they gave up their health insurance last August, Sue has continued to look for affordable insurance for herself and her husband. In researching various policies, she has found that high costs are not the only problem. She has also encountered discrimination against her husband because high blood pressure is considered a preexisting condition.

Just recently, Sue considered a policy for her husband that would cost \$500 per month, but had a 2-year preexisting condition clause that would exempt coverage for any conditions related to the circulatory system. He has never been hospitalized for his high blood pressure as it has been successfully controlled with medication.

The Gibsons are not alone in their dilemma. Sue personally knows of several other small business owners who are uninsured because they cannot afford the cost of health insurance. The high cost of health care coverage has forced small business owners across the State to sacrifice the peace of mind that health insurance brings in order to sustain the economic viability of their business. This is a choice that small business owners should not have to make.

The strength of our economy depends on the viability of our small businesses. Small business owners often make great sacrifices to establish and maintain their businesses. The Gibsons told me in their letter, "We have stuck it out in the good times and the bad times. We are willing to do this because having a small business, working hard, and seeing something grow from it is what we enjoy doing. Isn't small business what America is all about?"

Mr. President, many small businesses in America want to provide health care benefits for themselves and their employees but, like the Gibsons, find the costs to be prohibitive. It is clear that comprehensive health care reform is needed to control the escalating cost of

health care to help small businesses and everyone else whose peace of mind is jeopardized by this serious problem. The letter follows:

STURGIS, MI.
August 18, 1992.

Hon. DONALD W. RIEGLE, JR.:

We are writing to ask your help with a very serious problem. Enclosed you will find a copy of our latest rate increase on our health insurance. As you can see it will now be \$439 a month. This is a no frills policy, it is a \$1200 deductible, in hospital only plan. No office calls, no vision or dental, no emergency room, just major hospital care.

We can no longer afford to pay the premium, we will now be forced to join the millions of Americans with no coverage. Four years ago our premium was \$199 every quarter and now \$439 a month.

We are in our early 50's, and have never even filed a claim on this policy. They say it's due to rising costs. We have tried to keep up with the rising rates, but we can no longer afford it.

We have had a small business for 20 years. We have paid our own way. We have never asked for welfare, we don't have paid vacations, we don't have paid holidays or any unemployment benefits. We have paid our own Social Security in full. We have stuck it out in the good times and the bad times. We are willing to do this because having a small business, working hard and seeing something grow from it is what we enjoy doing. Isn't small business what America is all about?

What are our options now? What happens if we need hospitalization? We have worked hard, our home is paid for and we have a little savings. Will we lose a lifetime of hard work to a hospital bill?

We need to know these answers: If we need surgery will hospitals turn us away with no insurance? Will they even admit us? Can our home be taken away for non-payment of a large hospital bill? What are our options, we feel like we have none.

We are willing to pay for health insurance, we aren't looking for a free ride. I will be waiting for a reply from you and I hope you have some answers. We need help and we need it now. There are millions of other self-employed people who also need the same questions answered, I hope some help will soon be available for all of us. Thank you.

Mr. & Mrs. GERALD GIBSON, Sr. •

SENATE QUARTERLY MAIL COSTS

• Mr. FORD. Mr. President, in accordance with section 318 of Public Law 101-520, I am submitting the summary tabulations of Senate mass mail costs for the second quarter of fiscal year 1993, that is the period of January 1, 1993, through March 31, 1993, to be printed in the RECORD, along with the quarterly statement from the U.S. Postal Service setting forth the Senate's total postage costs for the quarter.

The tabulations follow:

SENATE QUARTERLY MASS MAIL VOLUMES AND COSTS FOR THE QUARTER ENDING 03/31/93

Senators	Original total pieces	Pieces per capita	Original total cost	Cost per capita
Akaka				
Baucus	64,235	0.07796	\$9,644.90	\$0.01170
Bennett				

SENATE QUARTERLY MASS MAIL VOLUMES AND COSTS FOR THE QUARTER ENDING 03/31/93—Continued

Senators	Original total pieces	Pieces per capita	Original total cost	Cost per capita
Bentsen	81,005	0.0459	15,434.91	.0087
Biden				
Bingaman	14,700	.00930	2,912.15	.00184
Bond	2,600	.00050	611.13	.00012
Boren				
Boxer	305,000	.00988	41,368.14	.00134
Bradley	42,700	.00548	6,075.24	.00078
Braun				
Brown	6,539	.00188	5,832.78	.00168
Bryan	72,550	.05467	10,322.85	.00778
Bumpers				
Burns	21,460	.02604	3,200.40	.00388
Byrd	848	.00047	756.42	.00042
Campbell				
Chafee	17,700	.01761	2,920.19	.00291
Coats				
Cochran				
Cohen	29,220	.02366	5,477.83	.00444
Conrad	41,975	.06600	5,975.76	.00940
Coverdell				
Craig	217,180	.20354	36,412.53	.03413
D'Amato				
Danforth	80,080	.01542	11,002.66	.00212
Daschle	17,790	.02502	2,525.27	.00355
DeConcini	72,581	.01894	16,710.27	.00436
Dodd	1,576	.00048	1,247.01	.00038
Dole				
Domenici	1,230	.00078	225.71	.00014
Dorgan	56,150	.08829	7,987.70	.01256
Durenberger	85,640	.01912	16,133.67	.00360
Exon				
Faircloth				
Feingold				
Feinstein				
Ford				
Glenn				
Gorton	220,165	.04287	38,717.85	.00754
Graham				
Gramm	107,990	.00612	23,731.43	.00134
Grassley				
Gregg				
Harkin				
Hatch	31,930	.01761	4,542.59	.00251
Hatfield	950	.00032	224.69	.00008
Hefflin	15,500	.00375	2,456.22	.00059
Helms				
Hollings				
Inouye				
Jeffords	2,130	.00374	417.27	.00073
Johnston	2,000	.00047	272.81	.00006
Kassebaum				
Kempthorne				
Kennedy	1,875	.00031	1,699.27	.00028
Kerry				
Kerry	76,500	.01275	11,619.99	.00194
Kohl				
Krueger				
Lautenberg	3,598	.00046	2,048.21	.00026
Leahy	5,250	.00921	1,047.54	.00184
Levin	2,050	.00022	462.85	.00005
Lieberman	28,275	.00862	4,329.43	.00132
Lott				
Lugar	42,325	.00748	5,975.41	.00106
Mack	49,325	.00366	9,084.90	.00067
Mathews				
McCain				
McConnell				
Metzenbaum				
Mikulski	61,000	.04939	8,676.22	.00703
Mitchell				
Moseley-Braun	41,720	.00230	5,731.85	.00032
Moyihan				
Murkowski				
Murray	55,005	.01712	13,819.91	.00430
Nickles				
Nunn				
Packwood				
Pell				
Pressler	9,300	.01308	1,751.87	.00246
Pryor				
Reid				
Riegle	37,056	.00393	7,547.70	.00080
Robb				
Rockefeller				
Roth				
Sarbanes	3,250	.00066	980.06	.00020
Sasser				
Shelby				
Simon	655,685	.05637	93,336.98	.00802
Simpson	23,560	.05056	3,232.68	.00694
Smith				
Specter	614,500	.05117	88,277.61	.00735
Stevens				
Thurmond				
Wallop	10,190	.02187	1,925.03	.00413
Warner				
Wellstone	103,500	.02310	15,051.44	.00336
Wofford				

Other offices	Total pieces	Total cost
The Vice President		

Other offices	Total pieces	Total cost
The President pro-tempore		
The majority leader		
The minority leader		
The assistant majority leader		
The assistant minority leader		
Secretary of the majority conference		
Secretary of the minority conference		
Agriculture Committee		
Appropriations Committee		
Armed Services Committee		
Banking Committee		
Budget Committee		
Commerce Committee		
Energy Committee		
Environment Committee		
Finance Committee		
Foreign Relations Committee		
Governmental Affairs Committee		
Judiciary Committee		
Labor Committee		
Rules Committee		
Small Business Committee		
Veterans Affairs Committee		
Ethics Committee		
Indian Affairs Committee	525	\$270.13
Intelligence Committee		
Aging Committee		
Joint Economic Committee		
Joint Committee on Printing		
JCMTE Congress inaug.		
Democratic policy committee		
Democratic conference		
Republican policy committee		
Republican conference		
Legislative counsel		
Legal counsel		
Secretary of the Senate		
Sergeant at Arms		
Narcotics caucus		
SCMTE POW/MIA		

**U.S. POSTAL SERVICE,
Washington, DC, May 17, 1993.**

HON. WENDELL H. FORD,
Chairman, Committee on Rules and Administration, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Detailed data on franked mail usage by the U.S. Senate for the second quarter, Fiscal Year 1993, is enclosed. Total postage and fees for the quarter is \$2,269,952.

A summary of Senate franked mail usage, based upon the first two quarters of actual data for Fiscal Year 1993, is as follows:

Volume	21,080,806
Revenue per piece	\$0.2480
Revenue	\$5,227,977.00
Provisional Payments to date	\$10,000,000.00
Excess in Provisional Payments	\$4,772,023.00

The first two Postal Quarter results, when projected to an annual figure based upon an adaptation of historical trends for Senate franked mail activity, provide the following estimates for FY 1993:

Volume	69,080,248
Revenue Per Piece	\$0.2101
Total Revenue	\$14,513,760
Current Appropriation	\$20,000,000
Estimated Surplus	\$5,486,240

However, due to substantial deviations in Senate quarterly mailing patterns, these estimates are considered debatable.

If you or your staff have any questions, please call Tom Galgano of my staff on (202) 268-3255.

Sincerely,

ALFRED CARREON, Jr.,
Manager, Post Office Accounting
Finance and Planning.

**FRANKED MAIL POSTAL QUARTER II, FISCAL YEAR 1993—
Continued**

Subcategories	Pieces	Rate	Amount
Total	22,322	4.1875	93,473
4. Orange bag pouches:			
1st class	4,794	3.709	1,778
Priority-up to 11 oz	77	2.8961	223
Priority-over 11 oz	318	5.2233	1,661
Total	5,189	7.057	3,662
5. Agriculture bulletins:			
1st class			
Priority-up to 11 oz			
Priority-over 11 oz			
3d class			
4th class special (bulk)			
4th class regular	23	9.5652	220
Total	23	9.5652	220
6. Yearbooks: 4th class special (BK) (Total)	1,792	1.4676	2,630
7. Other (odd size parcels):			
Priority-up to 11 oz			
Priority-over 11 oz	717	35.4979	25,452
4th class special (bulk)			
4th class regular	3,102	11.1863	34,700
Total	3,819	15.7507	60,152
Total outside DC	229,996	5.277	121,369
Permit imprint mailings:			
1st class single piece rate			
3d class bulk rate	7,401,403	11.79	872,779
Parcel post—PI	162	8.8889	1,440
1st class single piece—PI			
Address corrections (3547's)	53	3585	19
Address corrections (3d class)			
Mailing list corrections (10 names or less)			
Mailing list corrections (more than 10 names)			
Mailgrams:			
IPA—international priority air-mail			
Mailing fees (registry, certified, etc.)			
Postage due/short paid mail			23
Permit fees			
Miscellaneous charges/adj			
Express mail service			259,314
Subtotal	10,341,395	2195	2,269,952
Adjustments			
Grand total	10,341,395	2195	2,269,952*

**RESOLUTION RELATING TO THE
PURCHASE OF CALENDARS**

Mr. BOREN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar Order No. 69 (S. Res. 110), a resolution relating to the purchase of "We The People" calendars, that the resolution be agreed to, that the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 110) was agreed to, as follows:

S. RES. 110

Resolved, That the Committee on Rules and Administration is authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate, upon vouchers approved by the chairman of that committee, not to exceed \$76,960 for the purchase of one hundred and four thousand 1994 "We The People" calendars. The calendars shall be distributed as prescribed by the committee.

**AUTHORIZING THE SENATE
ETHICS STUDY COMMISSION**

Mr. BOREN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consider-

ation of Senate Resolution 111, introduced earlier today by the majority and minority leaders, that the resolution be agreed to, and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 111) was agreed to, as follows:

S. RES. 111

Resolved, That—

SECTION 1. SENATE ETHICS STUDY COMMISSION.—(a) ESTABLISHMENT AND PURPOSES.—There is established in the Senate the Ethics Study Commission (hereinafter referred to as "Commission") for the purposes of—

(1) conducting a study of rules and procedures relating to the Senate Select Committee on Ethics; and

(2) taking such actions as may be required to support the purposes specified in paragraph (1).

(b) MEMBERSHIP.—The Commission shall be composed of the following members:

(1) the Chairman of the Select Committee on Ethics, who shall serve as Chairman of the Commission;

(2) the Vice Chairman of the Select Committee on Ethics;

(3) the members of the Select Committee on Ethics; and

(4) such former members of the Select Committee on Ethics (including current and former Members of the Senate) as the majority leader, in consultation with the minority leader, shall recommend to be appointed by the President pro tempore of the Senate.

(c) VACANCIES.—Vacancies in the membership of the Commission shall not affect the authority of the remaining members to conduct the business of the Commission.

(d) CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this resolution shall be construed as restricting the authority of the Select Committee on Ethics or otherwise changing the authority of any committee of the Senate.

SEC. 2. SERVICES OF STAFF.—The Chairman of the Commission may designate Senate staff to assist the Commission; however, no additional staff shall be employed by the Commission under the authority of this resolution.

SEC. 3. GENERAL AUTHORITY.—For the purposes of this resolution, the Commission—

(a) is authorized in its discretion,

(1) to hold hearings;

(2) to sit and act at any time or place during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate; and

(b) shall be deemed a committee of the Senate for the conduct of hearings, including for the purpose of having printed and bound the testimony and other data presented at such hearings.

SEC. 4. EXPENSES.—(a) In carrying out its duties under the authority and purposes of this resolution, from March 4, 1993 through December 31, 1993, the Commission is authorized to make such expenditures as may be necessary from the Contingent Fund of the Senate.

(b) Expenditures from the Contingent Fund shall be paid out of the appropriations account "Miscellaneous Items" upon vouchers approved by the Chairman of the Commission, except that vouchers shall not be required for—

(1) the payment of expenses for stationery supplies purchased through the Keeper of the Stationery, United States Senate;

(2) the payment of expenses for postage of the Postmaster, United States Senate;

(3) the payment of metered charges on copying equipment provided by the Sergeant at Arms, United States Senate; or

(4) the payment of expenses for telecommunication services provided by the Telecommunications Department, Sergeant at Arms, United States Senate.

SEC. 5. REPORT.—The Commission shall report its findings and recommendations to the Majority Leader and the Minority Leader upon the conclusion of its study.

SEC. 6. TERMINATION.—The provisions of this resolution shall be deemed effective March 4, 1993, and shall terminate on December 31, 1993.

RECORD TO REMAIN OPEN UNTIL 3 P.M.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the RECORD remain open today until 3 p.m. for the introduction of legislation and statements.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDERS FOR MONDAY, MAY 24, 1993

Mr. BOREN. Mr. President, on behalf of the majority leader, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in recess until the hour of 1:30 p.m. on Monday, May 24; that following the prayer, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date and that the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that there then be a period of morning business not to extend beyond 2 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 5

minutes each; that at 2 p.m., the Senate resume consideration of S. 3, the Congressional Spending Limit and Election Reform Act of 1993.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECESS UNTIL MONDAY, MAY 24, 1993, AT 1:30 P.M.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate today, I now ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess as previously ordered.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 1:40 p.m., recessed until Monday, May 24, 1993, at 1:30 p.m.